



## ITIKARAṆA IN THE ṚK-PADAPĀṬHA

*Itikaraṇa* is a technical word used by Saunaka in his *Ṛkprātiśākhyā*<sup>1</sup> while explaining the method for knowing the final sounds of words. It means the association of the word *iti*, which is, of course, *anārṣa*, i.e. different from the word *iti* occurring in the *Samhitā* itself, and especially used by Śākalya in his *Padapāṭha*. This is the only word<sup>2</sup> used by the latter in his PP. Why he did so? The reason for this addition is difficult to investigate. Its correct significance too is far from clear. He is using the word in numerous and diverse cases, but never providing any clue by way of explanation. One feels that he was bound by certain conventions, as he could employ only two devices, namely *itikaraṇa* and use of the *avagraha* for purposes of clarification. Thus, naturally, each of the two, and specially the former, must have been used to serve many purposes.

### Abbreviations —

APr	—	<i>Atharvaveda-Prātiśākhyā</i>
AV	—	<i>Atharva-Veda</i>
MM RPr	—	Max Müller's edition of <i>Ṛk-Prātiśākhyā</i>
MVG	—	Macdonell's <i>Vedic Grammar</i>
Nir	—	<i>Nirukta</i> of Yāska
Pāṇ	—	<i>Pāṇinīya Aṣṭādhyāyī</i>
PP	—	<i>Pada-pāṭha</i>
RPr	—	<i>Ṛk-Prātiśākhyā</i> — Dr. Mangal Deva's edition
RV	—	<i>Ṛg-Veda</i>
SP	—	<i>Samhitā-pāṭha</i>
SV	—	<i>Sāma-Veda</i>
Say	—	<i>Sāyana</i>
TPr	—	<i>Taittirīya-Prātiśākhyā</i>
VPr	—	<i>Vājasaneyi-Prātiśākhyā</i>

1. *Prāk cānārṣād itikaraṇāt padāntāmstadyuktānām*, RPr. I. 58.
2. Besides the use of the *avagraha* (॑) sign.

Let us now study the whole working of *itikaraṇa* (i.e. where, when and how it has been added in PP) which is pre-requisite for the investigation of purposes it served.

### 1. Itikaraṇa after the Praṇhya vowels <sup>1</sup>

(a) Long *i*, *ū*<sup>2</sup>, *e*<sup>3</sup> are regularly *praṇhya*<sup>4</sup> in *Samhitās*<sup>5</sup>, when standing at the end of words in dual. The Padakāra has added *iti* word<sup>6</sup> after them, and observed *prakṛibhāva* very strictly between the two, e.g.

<i>ūtī avasā</i>	—	<i>ūtī iti   avasā</i> (1.185.9),
<i>rodasī apa<sup>7</sup></i>	—	<i>rodasī iti</i> (1.167.4),
<i>bāhū (ubhe)</i>	—	<i>bāhū iti</i> (1.95.7),
<i>te<sup>8</sup></i>	—	<i>te iti</i> (1.61.8; 104.3),
<i>tye<sup>9</sup></i>	—	<i>tye iti</i> (2.31.5; 8.2.42),
<i>mahīme asya<sup>10</sup></i>	—	<i>mahi   ime iti</i> (9.97.54).

(b) As Prof. Macdonell<sup>11</sup> has pointed out, under the influence of this nominal dual *e*, the verbal<sup>12</sup> dual *e* of the 2.3 present and perfect

1. This name implies that the vowel is subjugated to no further change. cp. MMRPr. LXIX; RPr. 1.68-72; VPr. 1.93-98; APr. 1.75-82. MYG. p.65, f.n. 23; Pāṇ I.i. 11-13, 16, 19, etc.
2. RV has very few simple *praṇhya* words ending in *ū*, and these too are rarely followed by an *ajādi* word.
3. It is regularly uncontracted because it consists of *a* + dual *i*. cp. MVG. 72.2.
4. RPr. 1.71; VPr. 1.93. APr. 1.75-8.
5. But not, when they are not in dual, e.g. *pṛthivī* (1.164.33); *śubhe* (5.52.8); *rodasī* (1.167.5) and *ūtī* (2.12.14) (for *ūtyā*).
6. Except in a few cases.
7. In a few cases, on the other hand, contraction though not written in the *Samhitā* text, must be observed in recitation as required by the metre, e.g. *harī iha* (1.121.8a) must be read 'harīha'.
8. It occurs innumerable time in RV in the accented (as well as enclitic) form, but is recognised *praṇhya* only in 13 places in PP.
9. Out of 32 occurrences, only in these two places PP adds *iti* after it.
10. But in few cases, contraction has, however, been written in the *Samhitā* text, e.g.  
*dhiṣṇyeme* - *dhiṣṇye iti ime iti* (7.72.3). cp. MVG. p. 66, f.n. 9. & Sāy's explanation.  
*rodasīme* - *rodasī iti ime iti* (7.90.3). Fortunately, the Padikāra is very careful to note such cases.
11. *ibid.* 72.2b.
12. For example, *namete* (2.12.13), *āsāte* (2.41.5), *āsāthe* (5.62.5), *bruvāte* (3.54.7), *yūñjāthe apah* (1.151.4), *vahethe* (1.180.9), etc.

middle have come to be uncontractable. And we find the Padakāra appending *iti* after all those cases in his PP.

(c) The first two vowels, namely *i* and *ū* regularly and *e* in few cases are treated uncontractable, when they express the seventh case<sup>1</sup> (locative). Here, again, we find *itikaraṇa* in PP, e.g.

*gaurī<sup>2</sup> adhi<sup>3</sup>* — *gauri iti* (9.12.3),  
*camū sutam* — *camū iti* (8.76.10),  
*mene parame<sup>4</sup>* — *mene iti* (1.62.7).

The final *i* of other cases also occasionally remains unchanged,<sup>5</sup> but the Padakāra has not appended *iti* in these cases, because the absence of contraction in the cases is only occasional and not regular.

(d) Under the influence of locative *ive* (which is *pragṛhya*), other pronominal<sup>6</sup> forms – *asme*, *yusme* are also always treated as uncontractable in SP<sup>7</sup> and PP, e.g.

*asme antar* — *asme iti* (1.24.7),  
*yusme id* — *yusme iti* (8.18.19).

The pronoun *ami<sup>8</sup>*, though never followed by a vowel in RV, has also been treated as *pragṛhya* in the Pada-text.

(e) The particle (*apṛkta*) *ū* has been written in its uncontracted form in the *Samhitā* except<sup>9</sup> the *ū* when preceded by a consonant and followed by a vowel.<sup>10</sup> The Padakāra regards it *pragṛhya*<sup>11</sup> always, hence

1. Cp. RPr. 1.72-3; APr. 1.74, Whitney 138d; MVG.71.2b and MM. LXXIII.

2. But contracted in *vedyasyām* – *vedi iti* / *asyām* (2.3.4). cp. Whitney 138 g. & Sāy.

3. Note *āṣṭrī padam* – *āṣṭrī iti* (AV. 6.27.3). RV in the corresponding *mantra* has *āṣṭryām* (10.165.3).

4. It has not been noted by Śaunaka.

5. MVG. 71 2c. cp. also Wackernagel, l. 270b, note.

6. RPr. 1. 73 & Pān. I i. 12-13, cp. also VPr. 1.96-7; APr. 1.77-8 & TPr. IV. 9-10 for the similar treatment in PPs of other *Samhitās*.

7. It is, however, doubtful whether they were so treated in the original text of the RV. MVG 71 2c. cp. also Oldenberg 455, note.

8. It is in plural cp. APr. 1.78; VPr. 1.98; TPr. IV. 12 & Pān. I.i. 12.

9. For instance *avedvindra* (1.28.1-4), *trirvaśvinā* (1.34.2), etc. The Pada-text is very helpful in such places.

10. Cp. RPr. 2.56; VPr. 4.87; APr. 3.36 & TPr. 9.17.

11. RPr. 1.75, APr. 1.72-3, VPr. 1.95 & MVG.p. 65, note 13.



addition of *iti* after *it* in PP is but natural. But it has been treated in a peculiar manner in PPs. It has been lengthened and nasalized,<sup>1</sup> e.g.,

*imā u ṣu* — *īm̃ itī* (1.26.5).

(f) As we have noted elsewhere the vocatives in 'o' from the *u* - stems, have been an exception to the rule in the *Samhitās*.<sup>2</sup> But their Pada-texts,<sup>3</sup> have treated them uncontractable regularly. They add *iti* after the word, in its natural form, i.e. the word regaining its original final *o* sound, and observe *prakṛtibhāva* very strictly between the *pragṛhya* vowel and the following *i* of *iti*, e.g.

*nṛtaviṣiro* — *nṛto iti | iṣirah* (6.29.3),  
*vāya ūtaye*<sup>4</sup> — *vāyo iti | ūtaye* (AV. 4.25.6).

For euphony in the second case cp Pān. VIII. iii.19. Elision of the semivowel *v* has given rise to the hiatus in SP. Śākalya has restored the last sound, and read the word in its original form.

(g) The true character of final *o* is not clear before consonants in SP. It may be representing a *visarjanīya*, as in *agregō* (9.86.45), *vāsoṇāyo* (10.26.6), *vaibhūvaso* (10.46.3), etc. The Padakāra has not added *iti* in such cases, and reads the words with the original *visarjanīya*, instead of the resultant *o*. But he has added *iti*, whenever *o* is original,<sup>5</sup> e.g.

*adhvāyo dr̥vayā* — *adhvāyo iti* (8.4.11),  
*pito madho*<sup>6</sup> — *pito iti | madho iti* (1.187.2).

(h) Still a group of cases in *o* is left. As they have been treated uncontractable even in the written text, they must be different from the preceding classes. *O* is representing most probably a combination of *ā* + particle *u*<sup>7</sup>. But, surprisingly, the Padakāra does not make clear such combinations,<sup>8</sup> e.g.

1. No satisfactory reason is readily apparent for it. See Whitney APr. p. 381.
2. See my article '*Śaunaka and the Abhinihita Samdhi in the R̥gveda*' published in *Indian Linguistics*, vol. 18 & MVG. 67.
3. Except that of SV.
4. For other instances in AV, see 7.4.1, 4.31.4, 5.13.5, 6.68.1, etc.
5. Except when it stands at the end of the first member of a compound, e.g. *gaviṣṭaye - go-iṣṭaye* (8.75.11). cp RPr. 1.70 & TPr. 4.2.
6. In the sense of 'food' 'nourishment', Grassmann translates it as 'Nahrung'.
7. Vide Sāy at 1.38.6, 39.6, 104.2, 167.8, 6.69.3; 7.34.12, etc.
8. That is to say he does not differentiate the original *o* from the resultant *o* except when resulting from the *visarjanīya* after *ā*.

<i>athś indrāya</i>	—	<i>atho iti</i> (1.28 6),
<i>o śvindra</i> <sup>1</sup>	—	<i>o iti</i> (10.179.2),
<i>draviṇo dadhānā</i> <sup>2</sup>	—	<i>draviṇo iiti</i> (6.69.3),
<i>sapto adhi</i> <sup>3</sup>	—	<i>sapto iiti</i> (8 28.5).

## 2. Itikaraṇa after the compound words

Now we shall take up the compound words, where the *itikaraṇa* is not so simple. He has usually analysed the compound words, showing the first and the second member, employing *avagraha* sign (ə) in between. When they have *pragṛhya* vowels, his work has been doubled, because firstly, he has to show that the word is *pragṛhya*, and secondly, it is a compound which should be analysed according to usual rules of analysis. Let us see how he analyses. He takes the word in the same manner, as if it were a simple *pragṛhya* word and adds *iiti*. And after this *iiti*, he repeats<sup>4</sup> the word in its analysed form<sup>5</sup>, showing the original sound that stands at the end of the first member, e.g.

(a) <i>saṃcaranti</i>	—	<i>saṃcaranti<sup>6</sup> iiti saṃ-caranti</i> (1.146.3),
<i>duratyētū</i>	—	<i>duratyētū iiti duḥ-atyētū</i> (7.65.3),
<i>vṛṣaṇvasū</i>	—	<i>vṛṣaṇvasū iiti vṛṣaṇ-vasū</i> <sup>7</sup> (1.111.1),
<i>dūreante</i> <sup>8</sup>	—	<i>dūreante iiti dūre-ante</i> (1.185.7; 3.54.7),
<i>viṣkabhite</i> <sup>9</sup>	—	<i>viṣkabhite iiti vi-skabhite</i> (6.70.1).

(b) If the word is *ajādi* (begins with a vowel), its initial letter is combined with the final letter of *iiti* (according to usual rules of euphony), when the former is repeated after it in the Pada-text, e.g.

<i>abhivṛte</i>	—	<i>abhivṛte ityabhi-vṛte</i> (6.70.4),
<i>itauti</i> <sup>10</sup>	—	<i>itauti iiti-ti</i> (10.31.7).

- 
1. The word *o* as a *pada* itself occurs about 17 times in RV, but never before a vowel.
  2. But *draviṇodaḥ* – *draviṇaḥ-daḥ* (1.15.10)
  3. Once an initial *a* has been absorbed by such a final *o* (AV. XX. 130.19). cp. APr. 80.
  4. Cp. RPr. 10.16 & APr. IV. 117 & 123.
  5. i.e. with the two members being separated by *avagraha*.
  6. *Anusvāra* cannot stand before pause, according to Śākalya. It must change into *m*.
  7. Why not *vṛṣaṇ-vasū* (the expected form) in PP?
  8. Is it a case of *aluk* compound? or it results from originally mere juxta-posed words?
  9. Restoring the original sound in the initial syllable of the second member if changed in SP.
  10. *gh-* here seems to be the original sound, that changes into *h-* in Classical Sanskrit *duḥ*. cp. IE. \**dheugh-*

(c) The Padakāra has tried more usually to retain the *Samhitā* form of the compound words before *iti* in his PP, but<sup>1</sup> occasionally introduced a change for restoring the original sounds, e.g.

<i>sūyavasyū</i>	—	<i>sūyavasyū iti su-yavasyū</i> (6.27.7),
<i>ṛtāyini</i> <sup>2</sup>	—	<i>ṛtayini ilyṛta-yini</i> (10.5.3),
<i>prithuṣṭo</i> <sup>3</sup>	—	<i>prithuṣṭo iti prthu-sto</i> (10.86.8)

(d) The *devatā-dvandva* compounds are never analysed in the Pada-text. When they have *pragr̥hya* words as their final member, *iti* is appended to them with *prakṛtibhāva* in PP, e.g.

<i>indrābṛhaspati</i>	—	<i>indrābṛhaspati iti</i> (4.49.5),
<i>satyānṛe</i> <sup>4</sup>	—	<i>satyānṛ e iti</i> (7.49.3).

### 3. Itikaraṇa after iva

The particle *iva* always forms a compound with the immediately preceding word in PP. Śākalya has recognised it as the second member in the compounds, and separated it from the 1<sup>st</sup> by *avagraha*. When this *iva* formed compound with a *pragr̥hya* word, a difficulty might have come before the Padakāra. The compound must have *iti* in PP. But where? Should he separate the two parts of the compound-word<sup>5</sup> – a thing unheard of elsewhere – and introduce the *iti* between them or should he allow *iti* to lose its proper function, but still be retained at the end of the compound, in order to call the attention to the *pragr̥hya* quality of the first member of the latter? The second of these two alternatives was adopted by all the Pada-texts,<sup>6</sup> i.e. *iti* is added only after *iva*, and never interposed in between.

A *pragr̥hya* word has remained *pragr̥hya* even before this *iva* in PP regardless of its nature<sup>7</sup> in SP. The sandhi has been observed

1. That is to say, the form before *iti* in PP is not always identical with that in SP.
2. Note also *Pada* reading of *abhiṛte* (6.70.4), *ṛtāvaso* (8.101.5), *abhiṣṭute* (7.39.7), *durhaṇo* (13.155.3), etc.
3. Śākalya is probably suggesting (in these cases) the original readings, which were later on changed in the written text as influenced by various tendencies working at the time.
4. A case of simple *dvandva* compound formed on the analogy of *devatādvandva* compounds. But it has been analysed in the AV-PP *satyānṛte iti satya-anṛte* (AV. 1.33.2). cp. APr. 4. 74.
5. Cp. APr. 1.82 & Whitney's note,
6. Cp. *ibid*.
7. The words having less than three syllables are usually taken as uncontractable before the following *iva*, even in SP. cp. RPr. 2.55.

between *iva* and *iti*, and the compound is repeated after *iti* with usual analysis, e.g.

<i>upadhīva</i> <sup>1</sup>	—	<i>upadhī ivetyupadhī-iva</i> (2.39.4),
<i>dampatīva</i> <sup>2</sup>	—	<i>dampatī ivēti dāmpatī-iva</i> (2.39.2),
<i>bṛhatīva</i> <sup>3</sup>	—	<i>bṛhatī iveti bṛhatī-iva</i> (1.59.4).

4. Then we find some other compound cases, ending in *pragrhya* vowel, which due to some reasons have not been analysed, but the *iti* is seen after them in PP, e.g.

<i>jenyāvasū</i>	—	<i>jenyāvasū iti</i> (7.74.3),
<i>payasvatī</i>	—	<i>payasvatī iti</i> (2.3.6).

### 5. Iti after Riphita-visarjaniya

A *visarjaniya* takes various forms before various sounds in SP. It changes into (a) sibilants before certain unvoiced plosives, (b) remains *visarjaniya* before others, (c) transforms along with the preceding *a* into *o* before the voiced sounds, and (d) some times it is dropped. If the *visarjaniya* or the resultant sound therefrom is representing the original *s* (*ariphita*), Padakāra does not add *iti* and reads the words only with the *visarjaniya*. But, whenever the original *r* sound<sup>4</sup> is represented by any other sound or dropped in SP, he has usually, restored it and kept it with the appended *iti*,<sup>5</sup> e.g.

(i) (a) <i>ahaśca</i>	—	<i>ohariti / ca</i> (6.9.1),
(b) <i>savitah ślokaṃ</i>	—	<i>savitariti</i> (3.54.11),
<i>punaḥ</i> <sup>6</sup>	—	<i>punariti</i> (1.110.1),

(c) It is usually the *ariphita-visarjaniya*, that changes into *o* along with the preceding *ā*, before the voiced sounds. But in few cases, under the influence of *ariphita-visarjaniya*, *riphita-visarjaniya* has also

1. The Padakāra has given up in favour of this *iva*, the division which would otherwise be made of the preceding compound, as *upa-dhī*, etc.
2. PP does not tolerate sandhi even with the following *iva*. cp. RPr. 2.55 & *Kāśikā* under Pāṇ. I. i. 11.  
Wackernagel suggests that here we have, probably, not contracted forms with *iva*, but the dual *ī+va*, the byform of *iva*. vide: 1. 270b, note.
3. No contraction in SP here, because of the metre.
4. But not when the *riphita* character is obvious in SP.
5. There he reads them with *visarjaniya* and without *itikaraṇa*, e.g. *prātaragnim - prātaḥ* (7.41.1).
6. At the end of the hemistich.

been changed to *o* in SP of RV. And unfortunately Padakāra has missed them to note, e.g.

*vyāvo*<sup>1</sup> — *vi / āvaḥ* (1.113.13),  
*āvo arciṣā* — *āvaḥ* (1.157.1 & 7.75.1),

(d) *avitā ratham* — *avitariti* (1.129.10).

(ii) (a) If the last member of a compound word has the *riphita-visarjaniya* Padakāra adds *iti* and repeats the word with the analysis, e.g.

*praṇetaḥ*<sup>2</sup> — *praṇetariti pra-netaḥ* (2 28.3),  
*vidhātaḥ* — *vidhātariti vi-dhātaḥ* (10 167.3).

(b) But not, however, in the case of the former member, possessing the *riphita-visarjaniya* in SP. The Padakāra has failed to show it in his PP, as he gives only *visarga* before the *avagraha*, e.g.

*antaḥ peyam*<sup>3</sup> — *antaḥ-peyam* (10.107.9), etc.,  
*uṣa uṣo* — *uṣaḥ-uṣaḥ* (10.8.6).

(iii) (a) Monosyllabic and bi-syllabic verbs at the end of a verse<sup>4</sup> or hemistich, showing (*riphita*)-*visarjaniya* in SP, not only take *iti* in PP, but are also repeated after it. Before *iti* it shows *repha* and after it *visarjaniya*, e.g.

*āvaḥ* — *āvarityāvaḥ*<sup>5</sup> (1,113.4, 14; 3.5.1; 5.45.1), etc.,  
*dhuḥ* — *dhuriti dhuḥ*<sup>6</sup> (3.38.3),  
*vāḥ* — *vāriti vāḥ*<sup>7</sup> (1.116.22),

- 
1. Cp. *vyāvardevyā* — *vi / āvaḥ / devī / ā* (8.9.16 & 7.75.1).
  2. But not in *aharahaḥ* — *ahaḥ-ahaḥ* (8.24.24), probably because it is almost obvious. It is forming the iterative compound.
  3. Cp. *antarvāvat* — *antaḥ-vāvat* (1.40.7)  
*antaspāthā* — *antaḥ-pāthāḥ* (5.52 10)
  4. But in a few cases, within a verse, verbs as well as non-verbs have been repeated after *iti* in PP —  
*akaḥ sasrjānaḥ* — *akarityakaḥ* (7.8.2).  
*svaḥ* — *svāriti svaḥ* (1 52 12; 129 2; 131.2; 8 50 8. etc.).  
*bhāḥ* — *bhāriti bhāḥ* (1.128.2).
  5. Cp. *āvartamaḥ* — *āvarityāvaḥ* (1.92.4). As SP shows *repha*, *itikaraṇa* is superfluous. To defend PP we expect *āvastamaḥ* in SP.
  6. But of 15 occurrences, in only three occurrences *riphita* character is not apparent, but the Padakāra has not added *iti*.
  7. Cp. Apr. 141; AV. 3.13.3; 18.1.32.

*vaḥ* — *variti vaḥ*<sup>1</sup> (2.14.3; 5.32.1), etc.,  
*kaḥ* — *kariti kaḥ*<sup>2</sup> (1.33.15; 61.11), etc.,  
*svaśca*<sup>3</sup> — *svariti svāḥ* / *ca* (3.31.19).

(b) In a few places, even a tri-syllabic verb has been repeated after *iti*, e.g.

*adardah*<sup>4</sup> — *adardariti adardah* (10.67.7),  
*rā hyebhiḥ*<sup>5</sup> — *rathyebhiriti rathyebhiḥ* (1.157.6).

(iv) *Anamolies*

(a) There are a few cases in *riphita-visarjaniya* in SP, but the Padakāra, however, does not show *repha*.

*savituh*<sup>6</sup> — *savituh* (10.36.13),  
*pūśco*<sup>7</sup> — *pūḥ* / *ca* (1.189.2),  
*āvaḥ*<sup>8</sup> — *āvaḥ* (7.79.1; 2.15.9),

(b) In few cases we do not expect *repha*, nor *iti* in PP, still we have, e.g. *praṇetar*<sup>9</sup> — *praṇetariti pra-netaḥ* (7.41.3).

## 6. Aripḥita-visarjaniya

In a few cases we find *aripḥita-visarjaniya*. The Padakāra has also regarded it as such. But however, he adds *iti*, and repeats the word<sup>10</sup> (in the analysed form, if it is a compound), e.g.

*pariṣṭaḥ* — *pari* / *sta*<sup>11</sup> *iti staḥ* (1.61.8),  
*pracetaḥ*<sup>12</sup> — *praceta iti pra-cetaḥ* (10.87.9).

1. It is a verb. Other *vaḥ* is the pronominal enclitic.
2. *Riphita* is always *svarita* whereas *svas-* is always *udātta*.
3. Cp APr. 141; AV. 7.10.1. It is a verb.
4. But *ajīgaḥ* — *ajīgariti* (10.106.1).  
*āvarivaḥ* — *ā* / *avarivariti* (10.129.1).
5. Occurring in the same circumstances, i.e. at the end of the hemistich, this has been repeated in PP after *iti* on the analogy of the verb.
6. Cp. *saviturdaivyāya* (1.35.5) and *saviturdvā* (1.35.6), etc.
7. Cp. *pūrbhavā* — *pūḥ* / *bhava* (7.15.14) and *pūrdevetrā* — *pūḥ* (7.52.1), etc.
8. But *āvaḥ* — *āvaritvāvaḥ* (7.79.1) (at the end of the hemistich).
9. We expected here only *pra-netaḥ*.
10. Max Müller at RPr. LXXXVIII suggests that Pada-text puts *iti* to show that the word is not *riphita*.
11. He drops the *visarga* before *iti*.
12. Cp. *pracetaṁ rājan* (1.24.14) where *aripḥita* has been treated as *riphita* in SP, but *pracetaṁ rājāta* — *pra-cetaḥ* (6.13.3). See Pāṇ. VI. i. 128.

7. We have noted five verbal forms – three ending in consonants and two in *ā* – occurring at the end of the 1st and 2nd hemistich. Pada-text adds *iti* after them with usual *sandhi* and repeats the word, e g.

*gdha* — *gdheti gdha* (1.158.5),  
*vark* — *vargiti vark* (10.8.9),  
*han* — *hanniti han* (10.99.6 ; 5.29 4).

(8) (i) In a few cases a certain final sound has been dropped in SP. Padakāra has restored it and added *iti*, e g.

*samī*<sup>1</sup> — *sam | imiti* (3.36.8).

(ii) In a few cases, a cerebralised dental (medial) in SP has been restored in PP; *iti* has been added and the word is repeated with analysis :

*praṇapāt* — *praṇapāditi pra-napāt* (8.17.13).

We have now seen the working of *itikaraṇa* in the RV-PP, and also examined the cases where he appended *iti* and where he did not. Although it is now clear from the above consideration that the Padakāra had suggested atleast the following things by *itikaraṇa*, yet further investigations are required for concluding the purposes it served :

(a) *Pragrhya* words (where contraction should not be allowed) which imply that the words have been used in certain fixed cases and number.

(b) *Riphita* character of the words.

(c) Original sounds (in case of cerebralization, etc ).

(d) *Ariphita-visarjanīya* in certain cases.

(e) Restoration of the dropped sounds.

(f) The verbal form occurs at the end of the hemistich.

---

1. The word *īm* occurs 220 times in RV. Only 10 times *m* is dropped before the consonants (voiced as well as unvoiced) in SP. Seven times it has been dropped in the IX *Maṇḍala* alone, 2 times in the I and once in the III *Maṇḍala*. PP restores *m* with the addition of *iti* in all these cases.

Dr. J.A.B. VAN BUITENEN AND Dr. ROBERT  
LESTER ON RĀMĀNUJA

It is good that Van Buitenen's condensed English rendering of Rāmānuja's *Gitā-bhāṣya* has been reprinted and a valuable treatise of Rāmānuja continues to be available to the students of Indian Philosophy who have to depend upon English translations. The three translations of the *Vedārtha-saṃgraha* and the monumental work of Thibaut on the *Sri-bhāṣya* are precious acquisitions. Dr Satyavrata Singh's painstaking work on Vedānta Deśika is a very systematic monograph on the great Viśiṣṭādvaita - Ācārya. Many minor books are also being brought into focus for the study of the non-sanskritic students of Vedānta. An adequate work on Rāmānuja's commentary on the *Gitā* has been a long-standing need.<sup>1</sup> The present work by Van Buitenen is one in that direction. While we should be grateful for what is given here - and what is given is quite good - it needs to be said that an abstract however comprehensive and conscientious cannot wholly satisfy. The principle of selection may not cover the needs of a thorough-going student. A summary serves a useful purpose when the original in *extenso* is available and not when it is to be used as a substitute. Van Buitenen is not wholly convincing in his assumption that a complete translation is either impossible or unnecessary. Rāmānuja's style is very gracious to the translator as the author ought to know, and his translation of the much more difficult *Vedārthasaṃgraha* is a successful venture. Rāmānuja's interpretation of the text of the *Gitā* takes the *sentence* and not the *word* as the unit of composition. In the explanation of the sentence the words receive their explanation through their equivalents. But complaints of this nature, for not having more than what is given, are

- 
1. Sri Govindacharya's literal translation has completely ceased to be available. Prof. M. Rangacharya's *Hindu Philosophy of Conduct* does contain the bulk of Rāmānuja's commentary but it cannot take the place of a translation.



not much to the point. We are to consider what the author has given us within the limits he has chosen to impose on himself, though the choice and the principle of choice do not meet with our approval.

The learned author has given extensive and scholarly notes. What is of greater value is his ample introduction. The introduction covers a vast compass and abounds in interesting observations. It deserves very special study. While for the Indian mind the *Gītā* represents Philosophy, Eternal wisdom, for the modern Western scholar it is a document calling for historical investigation. The learned author opts out for the latter mode of treatment. In other words, what he attempts is not a philosophical understanding but an Indological characterization of the *Gītā* and Rāmānuja's *Bhāṣya* thereon. This is a revealing definition of standpoint (p. 29). A traditional adherent of Rāmānuja's Philosophy may sense the danger that an indological treatment of his work might disclose grave errors. But luckily the author arrives at the gratifying conclusion that modern scholarship could never do better justice to the *Gītā* than what is contained in Rāmānuja's commentary (p. 39).

After noting the limitation of perspective and the commendatory conclusion despite the limitation, we may pass on to the other interesting remarks. We are told that the *Upaniṣads* present a Monistic Philosophy while the *Gītā* upholds Theism. Śāṅkara, it is pointed out, recapitulates the metaphysics of the *Upaniṣads*, while Rāmānuja reaffirms and elaborates the Theism of the *Gītā*. It is good that the fidelity of Rāmānuja's outlook to the *Gītā* is conceded, rather, asserted forcefully. Years ago, Hill, in his very informed and able writings on the *Gītā* made out the same point. This finding if viewed along with Thibaut's conclusion that Rāmānuja's commentary on the *Brahma-sūtras* is nearer the intention of the author than that of Śāṅkara goes a long way in establishing, even from modern standards, the authoritative character of Rāmānuja's version of Vedānta. Only the *Upaniṣads* get relegated to Advaita. This bifurcation of authority does violence to the best traditions of Indian Thought concerning the *Prasthāna-traya*. The followers of Rāmānuja can rise to the occasion and point to the frankly theistic character of the *Upaniṣads* like the *Muṇḍaka*, *Kaṭha* and *Svetāśvatara*. Even the older *Upaniṣads* - *Chāndogya*, *Bṛhadāraṇyaka* and *Taittiriya* contain a great deal of theism devoted to Saguṇa-brahman. A few sections, notably Uddālaka's teaching to Śvetaketu and Yājñavalkya's discourses can be claimed to deviate from the concept of Saguṇa-brahman with all the connected implications. But even their import is not so clear-cut. *Tat tvam asi* viewed in the context of the whole discourse appears to mean nothing other than the immanence of the creator in the world of

creatures. Much labour of scholastic argument is needed to establish that the idea of creation contained in the discourse is not meant seriously, that Brahman is not creative in a genuine sense and that the embodiment of the individual self is a pure fiction, set up by the deceptive agency of *Avidyā*, which *Avidyā* creative of individuality, has itself to be ascribed to the pure Brahman eventually. Countless exegetical difficulties have to be overcome before *tat tvam asi* can be accorded a plain Advaitic meaning. Similar is the situation with regard to Yājñavalkya's discourses. Yājñavalkya's discourse to Uddālaka called the *Antaryāmi-brāhmaṇa* is the basic authority for Rāmānuja's conception of *śarīra-śarīri-bhāva* between the universe and Brahman. His discourse to Gārgī speaking of the 'Imperishable' is plainly theistic in that it presents the eternal principle through whose command the universe in its totality is said to stand sustained. In the discourse addressed to Janaka called the *Jyotiṣ-brāhmaṇa* there is a reminiscence of the theistic *dahara-vidyā* of *Chāndogya*, and the teacher concludes with a rapturous proclamation of Brahman's cosmic glory. To take complacently that the *Upaniṣads* represent the Monistic point of view is, to say the least, an uncritical capitulation to a partisan dogma. Much more reflection on the *Upaniṣads* is necessary than is displayed in this easy identification of their import. The point is not that the *Upaniṣads* are not Advaitic. Rather a scholar with the abundant resources of modern scholarship has no reasons to admit so easily that they are. The facile allocation of the *Upaniṣads* to Advaita and the *Gītā* to Viśiṣṭādvaita does violence to the traditional belief in their unity of import and also does not substantiate such an understanding of upanishadic thought with the requisite critical consideration. Dr. Van Buitenen falls a victim to the beauty of the scheme of his invention that the movement of thought from the *Upaniṣads* to the *Gītā* is reproduced in greater elaborateness in the evolution of Indian Philosophy from Advaita to Viśiṣṭādvaita. It is also to be noted that there is nothing corresponding to the hostility of Viśiṣṭādvaita to Advaita in the attitude of the *Gītā* towards the *Upaniṣads*.

Dr. Buitenen recognizes Rāmānuja's indebtedness to Yāmuna's *Gītārtha-saṃgrah*, which Rāmānuja himself seems to acknowledge with utmost humility in his invocatory verses. But he doubts whether the elaboration of the clues contained in Yāmuna's work in the extensive treatise of Rāmānuja is altogether an authentic reading of Yāmuna's thought on some points which he specifies. That is raising an unanswerable question. We have no idea of Yāmuna's thoughts on those points except as conveyed by Rāmānuja and his interpreter Vedānta Deśika. In the absence of a definitely contrary possibility of interpretation, questions of this nature serve no purpose. Seeing that wherever Yāmuna's intentions are clear in the *Gītārtha-saṃgraha*, they have been splendidly

developed by Rāmānuja, we have to presume that where Yāmuna is not so clear, he has been rendered aright by Rāmānuja. Considering the extent of agreement, a little uncertainty with regard to two or three places does not make enough difference to require special mention. Moreover, Vedānta Deśika in his commentaries on both *Gītārtha-saṁgraha* and *Gītā-bhāṣya* demonstrates fully the links, even where they are not obvious.

Van Buitenen thinks that in a number of places Rāmānuja's interpretation of the text can be questioned as 'forced explanations which overstress a not impossible and often improbable sense of a passage'. From page 28 to page 38, there is a consideration of such exegeses. Almost every one of the interpretations is defended and explained by Vedānta Deśika both from the point of view of language and the structural coherence of the *Gītā*. If a certain interpretation, seemingly odd, renders the passage in question coherent and meaningful and other possibilities will result in attributing incoherence to the original, it seems to be fair logic to accept it. Such validation of Rāmānuja's explanations is accomplished in Vedānta Deśika's gloss. It does not appear that Van Buitenen has made adequate use of the *Tātparyacandrikā*.

What is of greater force is the number of difficulties that he encounters in understanding Rāmānuja's doctrine of *karma* and *jñāna* as put forward in the course of the first six chapters of the *Bhāṣya*. This is admittedly a complex problem but a careful scrutiny of Rāmānuja's clarifications does render his conclusion clear and unambiguous. All that can be said is that the synthesis of *karma* and *jñāna* is progressively worked out in the *Gītā* itself and each context wherein it is brought in adds some new idea and the interpretation of Rāmānuja follows the text developing the theory in corresponding progressiveness. The temptation to take developing account as a statement of conflicting ideas must be avoided. The total view emerging at the end is a rounded whole and Dr. Buitenen does not see any self-contradiction in it.

There are some minor oddities in Dr. Van Buitenen's attitude towards Rāmānuja and in his translation. We can cite two. It is repeatedly asserted that Rāmānuja was a priest in the temple at Srirangam. Rāmānuja was a saint and not a priest. He interested himself in the worship of deity at Srirangam. But he was himself never a priest at the temple. There is no shred of evidence to the contrary. In the translation of a passage of the commentary dealing with the last verse of the ninth chapter, Rāmānuja introduces a description of the physical beauty of the deity. Therein the expression *udārapivaracaturbāhuḥ* occurs.

It has been translated by Buitenen, in the following words: 'Whose four arms are bulky as bellies' (p.23). This is the most astounding rendering one can imagine. Why is *udāra* read as *udara* and why the 'arms being bulky as bellies' does not strike the translator as the absurd of absurd similes?

There is one startling contention in the introduction. It could have been brushed aside but for the fact that it is shared by many recent Western writers on Viśiṣṭādvaita. It concerns the doctrine of *prapatti*. The learned author opines that 'we miss in this brief exposition of Rāmānuja's views, that mystic doctrine which has grown so important in later Viśiṣṭādvaita, ..... the doctrine of *prapatti*'.

The doctrine of *prapatti* is manifestly a very important one and if it is proved to be absent in Rāmānuja's writings, that would indeed be a revolutionary finding.

Let us clear the ground for discussing the issue. It is undoubtedly a fact that in *Śrī-bhāṣya*, *Vedārtha-saṃgraha* and *Gītā-bhāṣya* Rāmānuja propounds the pathway of *bhakti* as leading to the final goal of salvation. But in all the three works *prapatti* also receives an emphatic affirmation. It is laid down in several places in the *Vedārtha-saṃgraha* and the *Gītā-bhāṣya*. In the *Śrī-bhāṣya* it finds prominent mention only in one important section (1.4.1). The problem is one of reconciliation. How can both *bhakti* and *prapatti* be exalted as the means for the attainment of God? Tradition has interpreted the position harmoniously and it holds *bhakti* to be the principal means and *prapatti* to be instrumental to the emergence of *bhakti*. So far the position is quite comprehensible.

The trouble starts with the conception that *prapatti* can itself be a complete, self-sufficient and direct means to *mokṣa*. Does Rāmānuja maintain this possibility? The answer is an emphatic affirmation if we accept the authoritativeness of the *Gadya-iraya* as a genuine composition of Rāmānuja. But Van Buitenen chooses to doubt the genuineness of the three-fold prayer. He says, "Rāmānuja's authorship of the *Gadyas* is not really established" (p. 127). Tradition is decisive on their authoritativeness. There are three old commentaries on the *Śaraṅgati-gadya*, those by Peria Vāccān Pillai, Sudarśana Sūri and Vedānta Deśika. Vedānta Deśika mentions an older commentary by Viṣṇucitta. These are eminent exponents of Rāmānuja and to discard their authority one needs the strongest reasons. Writers on Viśiṣṭādvaita in greater temporal proximity to Rāmānuja very clearly advocate the principle of independent *prapatti*, which is worked out in the *Gadyas*.

Yāmuna in his *Stotraratna*, Kūreśa in his *Pañcastava* and Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in his *Raṅgarājastava*, *Bhagavadguṇadarpaṇa* and *Aṣṭaślokī*, assert the doctrine of *prapatti* propounded in the *Gadyas*. This very concordance with the works of his predecessor and immediate disciples can establish Rāmānuja's authorship of *Gadyas*. There can be only two grounds for doubting Rāmānuja's authorship of short texts in question : (a) They propound tenets not found in the *Bhāṣyas* and *Vedārtha-saṃgraha*, (b) They assign to *prapatti* a supremacy not so assigned in the major treatises. The first ground assumes that the new treatises of an author must repeat the contents of the older ones. What if the new treatises are composed to set forth new thoughts beyond those of the older ones? This *apūrvatā* is a mark of authority according to Mīmāṃsā principles of interpretation. The new exposition may be an advance and expansion of the basis of thought presented in earlier works. Unless a real contradiction and not merely novelty is discerned, we cannot logically suspect the authenticity of the new works. The second ground is clearly fallacious. "*Prapatti* in the supreme sense is not taught by Rāmānuja and hence the *Gadyas* which teach it so are spurious; since the *Gadyas* are spurious Rāmānuja does not teach *prapatti* as the supreme means of salvation." The vicious circle is obvious. Neither Van Buitenen nor Lester in his monograph on the subject, have succeeded in proving that the *Gadyas* contain material inconsistent with the thesis of the earlier interpretative writing of Rāmānuja. That they propound ideas that go beyond the restricted earlier statements is, according to the criterion of *apūrvatā* indicative of their genuineness. The *Gadyas* proclaim doctrines not contained in the *Bhāṣyas* but not conflicting with them. They are a substantial addition to and completion of the theory of *sādhana* introduced in the earlier treatises. One wonders why scholars, otherwise so competent, entertain doubts of this nature with no grounds whatever. Dogmatic scepticism is no healthy trend.

Older Viśiṣṭādvaitins of all sects have examined the situation carefully and have offered illuminating explanations. Vedānta Deśika's *Nikṣepa-rakṣā* is wholly devoted to solving the problem in question. The main line of solution can be stated briefly. *Prapatti* or *śaraṇāgati* is an omnipotent means of securing all objectives. It can be resorted to for gaining mundane ends also. It can be efficacious in bringing about spiritual enlightenment. It can be instrumental in removing the obstacles to *bhakti*. It can also be exclusively relied upon for achieving final liberation. It can accomplish all this and every thing else if it is addressed to the supreme being and is perfected in itself by fulfilling all the requirements of ideal *prapatti*. This universal efficacy is proclaimed in the *Śāstras* every where not excluding the *Upaniṣads*.

The *Gītā* is full of the preaching of *prapatti* in general. But the *prapatti* specifically adopted in the *Gītā*, is for purposes of attaining and perfecting *Bhakti-yoga*. Rāmānuja's *Bhāṣya* thereon conforms to this determinate direction of *prapatti*. In the *Gadyas*, Rāmānuja teaches and also practises *prapatti* for achieving *mokṣa* itself, not doing away with *bhakti* altogether but praying for it as a part of the end and not as a means. The means is *prapatti* exclusively and it is all-sufficient. While the *Gītā* prescribes *prapatti* as instrumental to *bhakti* which in the text is adopted as the principal means, in the *Gadyas*, *prapatti* is taken as the principal means and *bhakti* in its non-instrumental sense gets absorbed into the substance of *mokṣa* prayed for. There is certainly a need to explain how both *bhakti* and *prapatti* can be regarded as the pathways to *mokṣa* in the system. The explanation is to be found in the classification of the aspirants to *mokṣa* into two types. *Prapatti* is for the aspirant not qualified according to the *Śāstras* to practise *bhakti* of the prescribed type, not patient enough to wait for the maturation of *bhakti* and not confident of his comprehension and successful cultivation of *bhakti*. The classification is an old one and a technical formulation of it comes from Parāśara Bhaṭṭa. While this traditional stand is clear and convincingly coherent, the scepticism sponsored has to support itself on supplementary suspicions.

It is a matter for real satisfaction that Dr. Van Buitenen withdraws his suspicion regarding Rāmānuja's authorship of the *Gadyas* in his later study of *Vedārtha-saṃgraha*. But his scepticism has entered the speculation of others working on Rāmānuja. One notable writer in this direction is Dr. Robert Lester, who in his laboured paper on *Rāmānuja and Śrī Vaiṣṇavism: The Concept of prapatti or śaraṇāgati* maintains the thesis that *prapatti* as the principal means of release is not taught by Rāmānuja. The only work ascribed to Rāmānuja, wherein this doctrine is put forward is *Gadya-traya*, more particularly *Śaraṇāgati-gadya*, and Dr. Lester builds up a case for rejecting Rāmānuja's authorship of the work. What is merely a suspicion on the part of Dr. Buitenen grows into a definite theory in the hands of Dr. Lester. Buitenen's withdrawal of the suspicion in his later work, we are advised, is not to be taken seriously. This is a pretty interesting situation.

Let us examine Dr. Lester's argument. His paper contains the following points of importance.

1. The *Śrī-bhāṣya*, *Vedārtha-saṃgraha* and *Gītā-bhāṣya* provide for *prapatti* as something instrumental and subordinate to *bhakti* and in these major works *bhakti* is presented as the means to release.

Comment: This is a wholly acceptable proposition and is admitted by tradition.

2. The *Śaraṇāgati-gādyā* contains the advocacy of *prapatti* as the principal means.

Comment : This is the admitted position of the Ramanujite tradition.

3. The *Śaraṇāgati-gādyā* is not a work of Rāmānuja for the following reasons :

a) It gives a position to Śrī which is not accorded to her in the major works of Rāmānuja.

b) It introduces the formula of *parabhakti-parajñāna-parama-bhakti* not found in the major writings.

c) It interprets *mokṣa* as the service (*kaiṅkarya*) of God while the other works speak of it as merely the *anubhava* or direct experience of *Brahman*.

Comment : These grounds simply show that the *Gādyā* does not repeat or cancel but goes beyond the other works. The *Gādyā* expands and develops the relevant affirmations of the major works. This is not a case of (*bādhā*) stultification but of (*vikāśa*) expansion.

d) The *Śaraṇāgati-gādyā* uses the *carama-śloka* of the *Gītā* as its grand conclusion. If we understand the *śloka* here as interpreted by Rāmānuja in the *Gītā-bhāṣya*, there will be an inevitable contradiction, for, while the *Gādyā* takes *prapatti* as the direct and principal means of release, the interpretation of the text of the *Gītā* in the *Gītā-bhāṣya* sees in it *prapatti*, which is only a mediate means instrumental to *prapatti*.

Comment : We are not to interpret the verse of the *Gītā* (18.66) as incorporated in the *Gādyā* as it has been interpreted in the *Gītā-bhāṣya*. In fact the *Gādyā* embodies the third mode of interpreting the verse in addition to the two modes given in the *Gītā-bhāṣya*, and that in favour of *prapatti* as the principal means. This third mode of interpretation is practically stated in *extenso* in the Lord's reply in the *Gādyā*. While the two interpretations given in the *Gītā-bhāṣya* go well with *bhakti-yoga* which is the central teaching of the *Gītā* according to both Yāmuna and Rāmānuja, the verse in itself is capable of bearing a third meaning also relevant to pure *prapatti* and it is that meaning that it bears in the *Gādyā*. The three interpretations are not conflicting. They are variations on the same theme that *prapatti* can accomplish everything. On the first interpretation it is an aspect of *bhakti*. On the second it destroys the impediments to the emergence of *bhakti*. On the third interpretation embodied in the *Gādyā*, it destroys the impediments to release.

Thus the *Gadya* constitutes an advance over the *Gītā-bhāṣya*. That the third interpretation is not a fabrication by later Śrīvaiṣṇavas but an integral part of the Ramanujite understanding of the all-important verse of the *Gītā* is evidenced by the fact that it is actually formulated, almost in the words of the *Gadya*, by a contemporary disciple of Rāmānuja, namely Parāśara Bhaṭṭa in his classical *Aṣṭa-śloki*.

The conclusion is irresistible that the *Śaraṇāgati-gadya* is a genuine work of Rāmānuja in which he speaks out his self-surrender to the supreme Diety. The establishment of this point at once eliminates the conjecture that Rāmānuja did not propound *śaraṇāgati* as a principal means to *mokṣa*.

On the whole the re-printing of this work is a valuable service to the students of Viśiṣṭādvaita. With the best of motives it may be added after all due appreciation, that the modern Indological workers on Indian Philosophy will be well-advised not to reject any traditional stand on paltry grounds. Dogmatic scepticism and adventurous conjectures are wings too feeble to support the flights contemplated.





## VĪRĀŚAIVISM AS EVOLVED FROM ŚAIVASIDDHĀNTA\*

Śaivism is a most ancient religious cult in India. It can be traced to *R̥gveda* and the archaeological findings at Harappa and Mohenjo-Daro reveal that worship of Śiva in the form of Liṅga existed even in those days – long before the Aryans made the entire stretch of land between the Mountain ranges of Vindhya in the South and the Great Himalayas in the north – their permanent home and spread their culture throughout India. Lately different systems of Śaivism like Pāśupata, Kālāmukha, Pratyabhijñā or Spanda of Kashmir, Śaivasiddhānta of South India and lastly Vīrāśaivism flourished in different parts of India and during different times though some of them coexisted at one or different parts of India.

A close study revealed that independent existence of different systems of Śaivism in India could not be maintained any longer and that there was a quick process of assimilation of such systems that came in contact with South Indian cultures into one system that came to be known later as Vīrāśaivism. This happened during the twelfth century A.D. We can gather enough evidence to prove that Vīrāśaivism was organised by a virile, revolutionary body of dissident members of Śaivasiddhānta order as a protest against the rigours of caste system, and the meaningless and laborious ritual which the parent body viewed with great reverence. As it is the case with all other new orders of religious upheaval, Vīrāśaivism also mustered a great following in a very short time and it spread like wild fire to all parts of Karnatak, as well as south-western Maharashtra. In this process, the Kālāmukha and the Pāśupata systems which had a large following in those areas merged themselves into one body, i.e. Vīrāśaivism. We shall now examine how Vīrāśaivism is a religious organisation evolved out of Śaivasiddhānta.

\*A Paper read in the All-India Oriental Conference, Twentyfifth (Silver Jubilee) Session at Jadavpur University, Calcutta, on 31-10-1969.

The evolution is not like a metamorphosis. A majority of the features of Śaivasiddhānta are there in Vīraśaivism and they can be glaringly traced out during the period of transition. The term *vīra* has a great significance. That does not merely mean valour shown in fighting an enemy. *Bhakti* in Lord Śiva is the common current that passes through Śaivasiddhānta as well as Vīraśaivism. To establish one's own *bhakti* to Lord Śiva in unequivocal terms, the *bhakta* willingly sacrifices any precious thing of his. That is what is meant by the term *vīra*. The *viratva* or the valour lies in the quality of one's own readiness to sacrifice to any extent for the sake of proving his devoutness to Śiva.

The *Periapurāṇam* written by Śekkīlār in Tamil narrates the lives of 63 such *virabhaktas* who are known by a collective name *Nāyanmārs*. In addition to Sundaramūrti or Nambi Ārūr of Tiruvaroor, Tirujñāna-sambandar of Sirgāli, and Vāgīśa or Tirunāvukkaraśu popularly known as Appar also of Tiruvaroor, who enriched or enlivened the Śaivism by their musical compositions called *tevārams* sung in praise of Lord Śiva, many other devotees who have shown the spirit of sacrifice in varying degrees are among the *Nāyanmārs*. I shall mention the names of a few such *Nāyanmārs* hereunder who have influenced the growth of Vīraśaivism by their spirit of sacrifice.

1. Iyalpaha Nāyanmār : When Lord Śiva appears before him in the disguise of an ordinary guest and desired to have his wife for him, he readily accepted and fought with those who tried to prevent him from fulfilling his promise.
2. Kannappa Nāyanmār or Tinnadu of Udumur : He plucked his eyeballs and tried to fix them in the void of Liṅga's sockets thinking that they are really got damaged by some disease.
3. Arivāṭṭāya Nāyanmār : He determined to kill himself by cutting his throat for the sin he believed to have committed in failing to supply a particular variety of food (Mango chips) to Lord Śiva at the appointed time.
4. Nandanār Nāyanmār : He entered bon-fire to purify himself before he entered the temple of Lord Naṭarāja at Chidambaram.
5. Čaṇḍeśvara Nāyanmār : He was offering a potful of fresh milk to Lord Śiva every day. His father could not tolerate this act of his son in wasting the pure milk. In anger he kicked the milk-pot one day, only to make his son realise his folly. But the son grew angry over the supposed sin committed by his father and slew him by cutting his legs with an axe.

6. Cirtoṇḍa Nāyanmār : The story of this Nāyanmār who offered the flesh of his own son to Lord Śiva as food is very famous.

7. Kalikamba Nāyanmār : He killed his own wife for trying to differentiate one *bhakta* from another, i.e. for reminding her husband the fact that the *bhakta* on whom her husband was attending was their own servant once, and hence, tried to dissuade him from showing respect to a *Jaṅgama*.

8. Gaṇambulla Nāyanmār : He was doing *dipārādhana-kaiṅkarya* to Lord Śiva every day spending his meagre income earned by selling grass or fodder. One day when his fodder was not sold in the market he oiled his hair and lit them to serve as light to Lord Śiva.

In addition to the above there are innumerable instances where devotees of Lord Śiva have shown the spirit of sacrifice (*viratva*) as narrated in the *Periapurāṇa*. The Vīraśaivism later accepted all of them to belong to their order and called them by a collective name 'Purātanar or Ādyar'. It shows clearly that the sponsors of Vīraśaivism have not discarded with Śaivasiddhānta but only tried to reform that order or moderate it to suit the needs of the day.

The Śaivasiddhānta could not attract all classes of devotees as it observed the distinctions of class and community even while performing *pūja* in a temple. Only those who wore sacred thread were allowed to enter a temple and not all. The story of Nandanār reveals the fact that even Lord Śiva himself respected that order of the day. He had to intervene and advise Nandanār on one side to purify himself by entering a bon-fire, and on the other, the Dīkṣitas of Chidambaram to create facilities for such an act. Śiva also did not order the Dīkṣitas to allow Nandanar outright into his temple. But the same Lord Śiva in the case of Naminanda acted boldly in advising him not to bother about the supposed pollution he got through mingling himself with all communities of people at a festival of *Phalguṇi* in Tirumanali. So the untouchability and the observance of pollution and other types of *sūtakas* (*āśaukas*) in the society observed by the communities wearing a sacred thread have stood in the way of spreading Śaivism quickly among masses.

The impatient society had to wait till the birth of Basaveśvara who could redeem the *bhaktas* from these evils of society. He took advantage of his exalted and powerful position as Chief Minister, the Chief of Exchequer and the Commander-in-Chief of the armies of Bijjala, the King of Kalyani, the capital of western Cālukyas during the latter half of the twelfth century. Basaveśvara announced a new order

in the religion of the day and invited all people equally to that order without showing any distinction from person to person in the name of low born and high born. Immediately the so-called low community-born people thronged round him and got good training in preaching the precepts of new order. Many of them became writers in and exponents of the high order of philosophy – their writings being mainly in the form of *vacanas*, 'a blank verse'. These *vacanas* are on a par with *Upaniṣads* among *Vīraśaivas*.

Some of the great contemporaries of Basaveśvara enumerated here belonged to the communities supposed to have been reckoned low and all of them have contributed to *Vacana-sāhitya*.

1. Siddarāmeśvara – a Gauḍa.
2. Maḍivāla Mācidevayya – a washerman.
3. Mōḷige Mārayya – a *kṣatriya* (doubtful).
4. Nūlia Ceḍayya – a seller of fodder and fuel.
5. Kinnari Brahmayya – a goldsmith
6. Śivanāgumayya – a *harijan* (*ādi-āndhra*).
7. Ambigara Cauḍayya – a ferryman.
8. Hāvinahāla Kallayya – a goldsmith.
9. Uriliṅga Deva and } described by Śrī Halakēṭṭi as belonging
10. Uriliṅga Peddi } to the community of untouchables
11. Varadānī Guḍḍavva -- a woman belonging to a goldsmith community – a learned propagandist and fought a battle successfully at Alam-puram in Kurnool District to save *Vīraśaivism* from destruction.
12. Dōhara Kakkayya – an untouchable (*harijan*).
13. Mēdara Ketayya or Devayya – a tatty-maker.
14. Ganada Kannappa – a fisherman.

There are many others who command much respect from top men of the day both political as well as religious.

The following are some of the notable points in the order of *Vīraśaivism* as a result of its being evolved out of *Śaivasiddhānta*.

1. A *sanyāsin* belongs to the highest order in the four *Āśramas*. But in *Vīraśaivism* – a *bhakti* – *Jaṅgama* – belongs to the highest order in demanding respect.

2. Though *Vīraśaivism* is having six classes as 1) *sāmānya*, 2) *vīśeṣa*, 3) *nirābhāra*, 4) *parama*, 5) *akhaṇḍa* and 6) *anādi*

they are quite different from the castes as recognised in Śaivasiddhānta. One individual can belong to all the above classes by virtue of his attainments.

3. There is no observance of five types of *sūtakas* (pollutions) among Virāśaivites as followers of Śaivasiddhānta have. They are pertaining to (1) community (*jāti*) (untouchability), (2) birth (*janana*), *jātāśauca*, (3) *uchiṣṭa* – food touched or seen by untouchables, (4) *rajas-āśauca* attached to woman at monthly courses. and (5) *maraṇa* – death (*mṛtāśauca*),

4. Virāśaivites will not accept all the *saṃskāras* of other order. They have discarded with *saṃskāras* like *upanayana*, i.e. wearing a sacred thread.

5. Men and women are equals in all activities – secular or religious; remarriage even for women is allowed.

6. Virāśaivites look with disfavour the worship of the deity in a temple. They worship only a *Śivabhakta* – a *Jaṅgama* whom they treat as equal to Śiva himself.

7. They have evolved a separate philosophy for them. The obtaining of salvation is through six stages called *sthalas* – (1) *Bhakta-sthala*, (2) *Māheśvara-sthala*, (3) *Prasādi-sthala*, (4) *Prāṇaliṅgi-sthala*, (5) *Saraṇa-sthala* and (6) *Aikya-sthala*.

8. They believe in past births (*pūrva-janma*), but not in rebirth (*punar-janma*) as a *bhakta* once ordained into the order of *saraṇas* becomes one with Śiva automatically. Hence no rebirth.

Intercommunal marriages became a common feature, for all the Virāśaivites after they wore a *liṅga* on their body belonged to one community. A famous at the same time a fateful marriage is that of the daughter of a brahmin convert Madhuvayya given in marriage to the son of a harijan convert Haralayya. Virāśaivites will not worship or give importance to fire (Agni) even in the marriage ceremonies. They place Liṅga in the place of Agni.

So the foregoing observations prove that Virāśaivism is only evolved out of Śaivasiddhānta with some modifications to suit the social order of the day.



SRI N. SUBRAMANIA SASTRI

## SRI ŚAṆKARĀCĀRYA'S LIFE IN THE LIGHT OF VYĀSĀCALA'S ŚAṆKARAVIJAYAM

Śrī Śaṅkarācārya, the expounder of the Advaita Philosophy, occupies a unique place in the spiritual and intellectual world. His teachings are recorded in his own commentaries on the *Brahma-sūtrās*, the ten principal *Upaniṣads*, the *Bhagavadgītā* and other minor works; but there is no contemporary record giving a correct and historical account of his external life. Of course, there are many works which narrate the life story of Śaṅkara, but these works, written centuries after him, appear to be mostly based on traditions which sometimes come into conflict with historical facts. To get a reasonably correct life-sketch of Śaṅkara, it is necessary to examine these works critically and pick out incidents which are supported by general agreement or strong traditions or an element of probability and then arrange them in chronological order.

The publication of Vyāsācala's *Śaṅkaravijayam* (VSV) by the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras has brought to light a comparatively ancient and reliable work on the subject. The high tribute paid to it,<sup>1</sup> and the verbatim reproduction of many verses from it by Mādhava<sup>2</sup> bear testimony to the authenticity and antiquity of this work. There is an element of probability in the incidents narrated by Vyāsācala and their chronological order appeals to reason. Therefore, Vyāsācala can be relied upon for drawing briefly the main outline of

---

1. *netā yatrollasati bhagavatpādasamjño maheśaḥ  
śāntir yatra prakacati rasaḥ śeṣavān ujvalādyaiḥ |  
yatrāvidyākṣatir api phalaṁ tasya kāvyasya kartā  
dhanyo vyāsācalakavivaraḥ tatkrīṭijñās ca dhanyāḥ |*

Mādhava's *Śaṅkaravijayam* (MSV), I. 17.

2. Even a casual reader can discover these verses. I have pointed out some of them in the foot notes later on.



Śaṅkara's life. My attempt in this essay is to draw a brief life-sketch of Śaṅkara basing my conclusions mainly on Vyāsācala and pointing out, wherever necessary, additional information obtained from strong traditions and later works which can well fit into the general framework of Vyāsācala.

Śrī Śaṅkara was the son of a pious brahmin Śivaguru by name. He was a native of Kaladi,<sup>3</sup> a small village near the Pūrṇā River (Alwaye river) in Kerala State. Śivaguru's wife, Āryāmbā or Satī, was a virtuous woman ever devoted to her husband. The couple had all that one would desire except a child. They worshipped Śiva with sincere devotion and prayed for a child. The prayer was granted and Śaṅkara was born.<sup>4</sup> The father did not live long to see the greatness of the child but died when the child was only three years old.<sup>5</sup> The mother brought up the child with care and affection. Śaṅkara showed his extraordinary genius and divine qualities even in his childhood. The mother got his *upanayana* performed in the fifth year<sup>6</sup> and he mastered all the *Vedas* within a short period of four years. Now the affectionate mother became eager to see her eight year old son get married; but the boy highly learned, begged her permission to renounce the world. The widowed mother could not grant this request of her only son easily. She tried her best to persuade the boy to marry and lead the life of a *gṛhastha*, but she had to yield in the end.<sup>7</sup> With a request that Śaṅkara should come to her at the time of her death and he alone should perform her funeral rites,<sup>8</sup> she permitted him to take up *sanyāsa*.

3. *kālaṭyākhya grāmavarye dvijāgryaḥ  
satsantoṣi keralesv ātithyaḥ|  
jajñe kartā karmaṇām coditānām  
tyaktā nityam ninditānām vinītaḥ||* VSV. I. 1.

4. *lagne śubhe śubhayute suśuve kumāram  
śrīpārvatīva sukhinī śubhavīkṣite ca|  
jāyā satī śivaguror nijatuṅgasamsthe  
sūrye kuje ravisute ca gurau ca kendre||* ibid. IV. 20.

Mādhava has reproduced the very same verse while describing Śaṅkara's birth. (Vide: MSV. II. 71).

5. It is stated later on that the mother performed the *upanayana* in the fifth year after the boy had completed his *dīkṣā* which is to be undergone after the death of the father. Therefore the father must have died in the fourth year of the boy.

6. *dīkṣām samāpya vidhivat kila pañcamābde;  
saumye muhūrta upanītim acikarat sā||* VSV. IV. 38.

7. Vyāsācala here describes the crocodile incident which is mentioned by almost all writers on Śaṅkara.

8. *samskāram etya vidhivat kuru śaṅkara tvam  
no cet prasūya mama kim phalam īraya tvam||* VSV. IV. 51. (Vide: MSV. V. 70).

Now Śaṅkara set out in search of a suitable *guru* who would initiate him into the sacred order of a *sanyāsīn*. Wandering through several places he at last met his *guru*, Śrī Govindabhagavatpāda, near the Holy river Narmadā. The *guru* soon discovered the greatness of Śaṅkara and taught all the *Śāstras* which he learnt in four years.<sup>9</sup> After the instructions were over, Govindabhagavatpāda directed him to write a commentary (*Bhāṣya*) on the *Brahma-sūtras* and explain their true import to the people. To accomplish the double task of writing the commentary and explaining the same, he went to Badari and stayed there for some years.<sup>10</sup>

Once a South Indian brahmin, Sanandana by name, approached Śaṅkara and expressed his desire to renounce the world, and enter into the sacred order of a *sanyāsīn*. Śaṅkara found him eminently qualified for *sanyāsa* and made him his first principal disciple. This Sanandana later on became famous under the title of Padmapādācārya.

One day when Śaṅkara was about sixteen years old, he had a vision of Vyāsa, the author of the *Brahma-sūtras*, who complimented him for writing an excellent commentary for the *Brahma-sūtras* and said that he (Śaṅkara) was destined to live only for sixteen years and that he (Vyāsa) would extend his life by another sixteen years for carrying out an important mission,<sup>11</sup> namely the establishment of the Advaita Philosophy on a firm foundation after defeating, in argument, the exponents of all rival schools of thought. Soon after this incident, Śaṅkara had a call from his mother. He rushed to Kaladi and was by her side in her

9 *śrī śaṅkaro 'ṣṭamasamaś caturō 'pi vedān  
sa dvādaśe sakalaśāstrakalēm avāpa* | *ibid.* 65.

10. Mādhava describes the stay of Śaṅkara at Kasi also for teaching the *Bhāṣya*. It is quite likely that Śaṅkara spent some years between Badari and Kasi, writing commentaries to the *Brahmasūtras*, the ten *Upaniṣads* and the *Bhagavad-gītā* while staying at Badari, and teaching them at Kasi where students from various parts of India came for studies.

11. *varṣāṇi ṣoḍaśa tavūyur iti prakṛiptam  
tēvanti te punar aham vitarāṇi jīvam  
advaitadarśanam idaṁ kuru satpratiṣṭham  
loke vinodacaraṇaṁ sahito vineyāḥ* [ ] VSV. IV. 83.

Mādhava describes a contest between Śaṅkara and Vyāsa at Kasi where Vyāsa is said to have appeared before Śaṅkara in the disguise of an old Brahmin.

last days.<sup>12</sup> When she died, the relatives refused to render any help to Śaṅkara. They were ritualists who objected to a *sanyāsin* performing the rites of his mother. Śaṅkara somehow managed to perform her last rites,<sup>13</sup> and cursing the relatives for their hard heartedness, he went back to Badari. From there he proceeded to Prayaga with his disciples and bathed in the holy confluence of the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā praying for the salvation of his mother's soul.<sup>14</sup>

Now Śaṅkara set out on his great mission of establishing the supremacy of the *Advaita-siddhānta*. The first scholar whom he met at Prayaga was the grand old Mīmāṃsaka, Kumārila Bhaṭṭa<sup>15</sup> who was then preparing to depart from this world after successfully carrying out his mission of driving out Buddhism from India. This great Mīmāṃsaka directed Śaṅkara to his learned disciple, Viśvarūpa, popularly known as Maṇḍanamiśra<sup>16</sup>.

12. Mādhava describes the death of Śaṅkara's mother at a later stage when Śaṅkara was staying at Śrīngagiri in the course of his *digvijaya*. By that time Śaṅkara's fame must have spread all over India and hence it looks strange that the people of Kerala alone did not recognise his greatness and refused to render any help to him. Almost all writers on Śaṅkara say that Śaṅkara was destined to live only for sixteen years and that Vyāsa extended his life by another sixteen years for carrying out his mission. This suggests that Śaṅkara had a very bad period in his sixteenth year and that it should have passed off with the death of his mother. She must have died before the extended life of Śaṅkara began and the tour of *digvijaya* should have commenced only after that.

13. It is stated later on that Śaṅkara bathed in Trivenī and prayed for the salvation of his mother's soul only for *janasamgraha*, to show the people how a mother is to be respected. The same should be the reason for performing the last rites of the mother, though a *sanyāsin* has no right to do so. The relatives were cursed because they did not realise the spirit in which Śaṅkara performed the rites.

14. *sasnau prayāge saha śiṣyasamghaiḥ  
svayam kṛtārtho janasamgrahārthi |  
asmāri mātāpi ca yā pupuṣa  
dayārasā duḥkham asodha bhūri ||* VSV. V. 9.

(Vide Mādhava also : VII. 72). Here the same verse is repeated. After the death of the mother, Mādhava mentions Śaṅkara's visit to Rameswaram. These visits to Rameswaram and Prayaga might be in accordance with the custom of pious Hindus after the death of the parents. They do not form part of the *digvijaya* tour.

15. While all biographers of Śaṅkara describe this meeting of Śaṅkara with Kumārila, modern scholars point out to the improbability of such a meeting on the ground that Śaṅkara was removed from Kumārila by at least a hundred years. It is quite probable that Kumārila lived for more than hundred years and the meeting took place when he was about to die.

16. Vyāsācala distinguishes Maṇḍanamiśra, the author of *Brahma-siddhi*, from Viśvarūpa who was also known as Maṇḍanamiśra.

Maṇḍanamīśra residing in the city of Māhiṣmatī was a *gṛhasṭha* in the true sense of the word. He was fortunate to have a virtuous wife Ubhayabhārati or Sarasavāṇī who was as learned as her husband was.<sup>17</sup> Both of them were ritualists to the core. When Śaṅkara went to their house, he was received with due honour;<sup>18</sup> but before taking his food, Śaṅkara demanded *vāda-bhikṣā* (a contest) to which Maṇḍana readily agreed. A condition was also laid down that the defeated person should take up the *āśrama* (order of life) of the victor and become his disciple.<sup>19</sup> Maṇḍana's wife Ubhayabhārati was appointed as judge. The contest went on for seven days with intervals for daily routine. In the end Maṇḍana showed signs of defeat and Ubhayabhārati gave her decision by inviting both for *bhikṣā*. Maṇḍana took up the order of a *sanyāsin* and became the second principal disciple of Śaṅkara under the name Sureśvarācārya. After this event, Ubhayabhārati remained in seclusion. It is said that due to curse of Durvāsas, Goddess Sarasvatī was born as Ubhayabhārati who got herself freed from the curse as a result of her meeting with Śaṅkara and went back to her heavenly abode.<sup>20</sup>

The encounter with Maṇḍana is one of the most thrilling episodes in Śaṅkara's life. The news of Maṇḍana's defeat spread like wild fire and many new disciples joined Śaṅkara. Now Padmapāda desired to

17. In describing the marriage of Viśvarūpa and Ubhayabhārati, Mādhava reproduces many verses of Vyāsācala. (Vide: VSV. VI and MSV. III.).

18. The wrath of Viśvarūpa on the sight of a *sanyāsin* on the *śrāddha* day, the miracle of Śaṅkara entering the closed doors of Maṇḍana's house mysteriously, and the abusive duel between the great men – Śaṅkara and Maṇḍana as described by Mādhava, find no place in Vyāsācala who describes Viśvarūpa receiving Śaṅkara with due respect.

*sa viśvarūpaḥ kṛtavāhnikāryaḥ pratīkṣamāṇo 'tithim ūtithyaḥ |  
udaikṣatānam svaśarīrahābhīḥ prakāśayantam vidīśo dīśaś ca ||  
sa bhikṣave 'dṛṣṭācarāya tasmāi samkalpya bhikṣām padayor amuṣya |  
cikṣepa puṣpaṃ caraṇāv a tejaḥ tatpāthasātmanam aśīcataddhā. ||*

VSV. VI. 2-3.

19. Though a *sanyāsin* should never change his *āśrama*, Śaṅkara accepted the condition because he was sure that he would never be defeated.

20. *uktvetham ādaradhiyā vacanaṃ svabhartuḥ  
antardadhe suvaṇāṇāṃ kila sūpamuktā | VSV. VI. 102.*

Mādhava and others make Ubhayabhārati remain for some days more at the request of Śaṅkara and they describe, in detail, Śaṅkara's dialectic controversy with her. Their accounts appear to be neither probable nor edifying. There was no propriety in, or need for Śaṅkara to have compelled her to stay when she was preparing to return to her heavenly abode after the completion of her mission and curse.

go on a pilgrimage to the South. With a note of caution Śaṅkara gave his consent.

Śaṅkara then proceeded to conquer a sect of people known as Kāpālikas who mostly inhabited the northern regions of Deccan. Śaṅkara spent some time in these parts defeating the opponents one by one. One Kāpālika who realised the futility of arguing with Śaṅkara, hatched a plan to do away with his life. His attempt was thwarted by the timely arrival of Padmapāda.

Then marching towards Gokarṇam Śaṅkara had an attack of *bhagandhara*, a fistula in the pudendum muliebre. One of his disciples, Ānandagiri by name nursed him patiently with great devotion<sup>21</sup> After some treatment which Śaṅkara at first refused to take, the disease was brought under control.<sup>22</sup> The selfless services of Ānandagiri pleased the *Guru* so much that he conferred his choicest blessings on him and accepted him as his third principal disciple under the title of Toṭakācārya.

Completely freed from his disease, Śaṅkara continued his journey to Gokarṇam.<sup>23</sup> On the way he happened to pass through a small village called Śrīvali. Here was a boy who apparently looked an idiot. His parents who were worried about the mental state of the boy, brought him to Śaṅkara who quickly discovered the real greatness of the boy. Even as a child, he had attained the knowledge of *Brahman*. Śaṅkara

21. *citīānuvartī nijadharmacārī*  
*bhūtānukampī tanuvāgvibhūtiḥ*  
*kaścīd vineyo 'jani deśikasya*  
*yaṁ toṭakācāryam udāharanti ||* VSV. IX. 84.

While introducing Ānandagiri, Mādhava also repeats the same verses of Vyāsācala. Vide: XII. 70-74.

22. Mādhava describes the illness of Śaṅkara at a later stage. He further states that one Abhinavagupta practiced evil spells on Śaṅkara and the illness was due to that. In the absence of any other evidence to support the Abhinavagupta tradition, it is safer to rely on Vyāsācala who describes the illness soon after the encounter with the Kāpālikas. The Kāpālikas were notorious for practicing evil spells and some of them had a grudge against Śaṅkara. Moreover Ānandagiri is introduced both by Vyāsācala and Mādhava when Śaṅkara was staying at Śrīngagiri or near abouts. He came to prominence only through his services to the *Guru* and the nature of the services described indicates the illness of the *Guru*.
23. Mādhava describes the stay of Śaṅkara at Śrīngagiri for a long time and the installation of Śārādā temple. It is quite likely that the beautiful surroundings and the calm atmosphere on the banks of the river Tūṅgā provided a suitable retreat for the ailing *saṁyāsīn* where he stayed for sometime.

took him as his fourth principal disciple, under the name Hastāmalakā-cārya.

From Śrīvali Śaṅkara went to Gokarṇam and stayed there for a few days. Then he proceeded to Kashmir visiting several places on the way.<sup>24</sup> Kashmir in those days was a seat of learned men.<sup>25</sup> Here the followers of the various systems of philosophy had their turn of contest with Śaṅkara. His victory over them entitled him to ascend the *Sarvajñapiṭha* kept in the temple of Śāradā. When Śaṅkara was about to ascend the *piṭha*, it is said, an invisible voice told him that he had no right to sit on the seat of *Sarvajña* as he was ignorant of one branch of learning, namely *Kāmasāstra*. This was the voice of Śāradā. Śaṅkara asked for a week's time to master that branch, and by the device of *parakāyapraveśa* (transmigration of the soul) he learnt that art without polluting his body. Then answering the questions of Śāradā he ascended the *Sarvajñapiṭha*.<sup>26</sup>

Vyāsācala concludes his work here with a brief remark that Śaṅkara afterwards went to places he liked.

*evam niruttarapadām sa vidhāya devīm  
sarvajñapiṭham adhiruhya nananda sabhyaḥ<sup>27</sup> |  
mātrā girām api tathā puruṣaiś ca sabhyaiḥ  
sambhāvito rucitadeśam ayaṁ jagāma. ||* VSV. XII. 82.

Having composed his work in the *Kāvya* style, Vyāsācala must have thought it proper to end his work with the auspicious incident of *Sarvajñapiṭhārōhaṇa*. Hence he did not describe Śaṅkara's subsequent travels and last days.

Now the question may be asked – To which place or places did Śaṅkara go from Kashmir? Mādhava says that he went to Badari and

24. Mādhava and others describe the visit of Śaṅkara to Mukambika, Ujjayini, Dwaraka and several other places. Vyāsācala seems to have omitted some details which can be taken from other sources and included here provided they are supported by other strong traditions and do not come into conflict with the main outline of Vyāsācala. Śaṅkara seems to have combined *tīrthayātrā* with his *dīgviṣaya* and must have certainly visited many more places on the way.
25. Mādhava describes the visit to Kashmir at a later stage. Vyāsācala's sequence appears to be more probable since he conforms to the *pradakṣiṇa* order of the tour and does not make Śaṅkara pass through the same place a second time.
26. Cidvilāsa, Govindanātha and some others describe the *Sarvajñapiṭhārōhaṇa* as having taken place at Kanchi.
27. Vide: MSV. XVI. 87.

then to Kedara, where he met with his end. This is alright with Mādhava who describes Śaṅkara's visits to places in the East and South at an earlier stage; but Vyāsācala has not mentioned anything about the tour of Śaṅkara to these regions. All biographers of Śaṅkara are unanimous in their accounts regarding Śaṅkara's visit to these parts. Therefore, if one follows the tour as described by Vyāsācala<sup>28</sup> carefully, keeping in mind the strong traditions and the versions of Mādhava and others regarding the places visited by Śaṅkara in the East and South, it will be clear that Śaṅkara, starting from Kashmir should have gone to the eastern parts of India through the Himalayan slopes and then to the south through the east coast. During this tour he should have passed through Nepal, Jagannath<sup>29</sup> and Āndhra-deśa and finally reached Kanchi. The strong tradition of Śaṅkara's visit to Nepal and the existence of two great Mutts at Jagannath and Kanchi strongly support this conclusion.

There is some mystery about the place where Śaṅkara spent his last days. Mādhava says that it was at Kedara in the Himalayas. Some say it was at Kanchi while others take Śaṅkara back to his birth place in the end.<sup>30</sup> The last view can be rejected as improbable since Śaṅkara would not have gone back to his birth place after his bitter experience at the time of his mother's death.<sup>31</sup> Mādhava's version is probable if his account of the *digvijaya* is accepted, but we have already pointed out in our foot notes how Mādhava's version of *digvijaya* cannot be accepted. If we follow Vyāsācala's account, we can reasonably presume that Śaṅkara came to the South towards the end of his life and if this is accepted, Kanchi seems to be the most likely place where he met with his end at the age of thirty two.

28. The places visited by Śaṅkara in the course of his *digvijaya* and the route followed by him, are variously described by Mādhava and other writers. While their accounts are useful for getting some details about Śaṅkara's tour, they do not appear to provide a probable sequence of events. Vyāsācala's account, though brief, gives a well planned tour and conforms to the orthodox way of performing *tīrthayātrā* and *digvijaya* in the *pradakṣiṇa* order.

29. Here again Śaṅkara should have visited several places which are to be known from other sources.

30. *krameṇa śiṣyasamṣukto vṛṣācalam avāptavān*, Govindarātha, IX. 18.

This Vṛṣācala is identified with Trichur by some while others say that it is a small hill near Kaladi itself. I am told by Prof. Mahāmāhopādhyaya N.S. Ananthakrishna Sastrigal that the Tirupati Hills are also known as Vṛṣācala.

31. According to Mādhava, Śaṅkara cursed the Kerala Brahmins that no *sanyāsin* would take *bhikṣū* in their houses.

Almost all authors on Śaṅkara mention his visit to Kanchi. The *Srī-cakra-pratiṣṭhā* in the Kāmākṣī temple indicates his stay in that city for a comparatively long period.<sup>32</sup> There is at least one author, Ānandagiri who describes Śaṅkara's final day at Kanchi.<sup>33</sup> The title of the Mutt at Kanchi '*kāma-koṭi*' suggests that the mission of Śaṅkara ended there.<sup>34</sup> Kanchi is the only South Indian city counted among the *mokṣapuris* of India,<sup>35</sup> and hence there is every probability of Śaṅkara choosing that city for his final *samādhi*. The two *stotra* works, *Sivā-nandalaharī* and *Saundaryalaharī*, composed by Śaṅkara contain several verses revealing the author's familiarity with the temples and devotees in and around Kanchi.

As regards the establishment of Mutts by Śaṅkara, Vyāsācala and Mādhava do not say anything definite and it seems that Śaṅkara himself did not establish any of them. Vyāsācala hints to the existence of four Mutts in one of his concluding verses, but he does not say who established them and where they were located.<sup>36</sup> Mādhava does not mention the establishment of the Śṛṅgagiri Mutt when Śaṅkara was staying there, but later on says that Śaṅkara stationed some of his disciples in Śṛṅgagiri and other places.<sup>37</sup> This only suggests that after completing his tour of *digvijaya*, Śaṅkara directed some of his disciples to go and settle down in different parts of India to carry out his mission. In the absence of any definite reference by these two authors to the establishment of Mutts by Śaṅkara, it will not be quite unreasonable to conclude that Śaṅkara did not establish any Mutt and that his disciples alone founded

32. In two other places – Śṛṅgagiri and Badari – where Śaṅkara stayed for long, he built two temples of Śārādā and Nārāyaṇa respectively.

33. *vāṇīm vijitya ca vīyadvīśadām adehām  
sarvājñāpīṭham adhiruhyā ca tatra kāñcyām |  
vidvadvārārcitapado yamīśārvabhaumo  
devyāḥ purāḥ paratare puruṣe vilīlye ||*

Vide also Dhanapatisuri's commentary on MSV. XVI. 100 where he quotes: *prāptūn vijityāttarasākṣataśāstravādaiḥ miśrūn sa kāñcyām atha siddhim ūpa. (Śivarahasyam).*

34. The title of the Mutt '*Kāmakoti*' is generally understood to refer to one of the *kalas* of Kāmākṣī, but I think it has another significance, namely the *kāma*, mission (of Śaṅkara) had its *koṭi*, end at Kanchi.

35. *ayodhyā mathurā mūyā kāsī kāñcī avantikā |  
purī dvāravatī caiva saptaite mokṣadūyakāḥ ||*

36. *ekah śākhī śaṅkarākhyā caturdhā  
sthānam bheje tūpaśūntyai prajānām |* VSV. XII. 83.

37. *katicana viniveśyātharṣyaśrīnūśramādau  
manir atha badarīm sa prūpa kaiścit vāśīṣyaiḥ |* MSV. XVI. 93.



the Mutts in places where they settled down.<sup>38</sup> It is also likely that one and the same disciple of Śaṅkara established more than one Mutt. As a matter of fact, both Śṛṅgagiri and Kañcikāmakoti Mutts claim Sureśvarācārya as their first head. Padmapāda might have established a Mutt at Badari where he is said to have spent his last days. Hastāmalaka and Toṭakācārya would have established the two Mutts at Dwaraka and Jagannath. It is also likely that some of the less known disciples of Śaṅkara founded Mutts elsewhere.

It will be seen from the above account that Vyāsācala has not mentioned certain improbable incidents that are found in other works and that he gives a comparatively reliable account of Śaṅkara's life. The publication of this work has opened a new path for research. I do not pretend that my conclusions are final. I have only given my impressions after a study of Vyāsācala in the hope that they may lead to further research on the subject.

---

38. Cidvilāsa locates four Mutts at Śṛṅgagiri, Dwaraka, Badari and Jagannath.

## ŚABDA, NIŚŚABDA IN ŚŪNYASAMPĀDANE

The *Śūnyasampādana* is a book consisting of *vacanas* (i.e. mystic sayings) arranged in a dialogue form containing discussions on metaphysical, religious and mystical questions. and can be compared to the Dialogues of Plato.<sup>1</sup> Some of the distinguished mystic philosophers who took part in the discussions are Basavaṇṇa, Cennabasavaṇṇa, Allamaṇḍaprabhu, Siddharāmayya, Gorakṣanātha, Mukṭāyaka and Lakṣmaṇa. They gave a turn to the religious renaissance of the twelfth century in Karnatak.<sup>2</sup> One of the problems that was under discussion is *śabda* (word) and *niśśabda* (non-word) which demands analysis.

*Śabda* and *niśśabda* have different connotation; accordingly as they occur in metaphysical, religious and mystical contexts. The two concepts, *śabda* and *niśśabda* are two different types of metaphysical entities; and also pertain to two lores leading to two types of enlightenment. The *Upaniṣads*, the *Bible* and the *Qur'ān* are the texts in which the philosophy of the 'word' is expounded. Therefore the 'word' is a striking common link that connects the occidental and oriental worlds of religion, mysticism and metaphysics.

*Śabda* in its different aspects dominates the Upanishadic texts. And the meaning of the two terms varies from one text to the other. *Śabda* is *praṇava* and *udgita* in Yajurvedic and Samavedic *Upaniṣads* respectively. The term *śabda* is used in the sense of the Absolute.<sup>3</sup>

1. Dr. R.D. Ranade: *The Pathway to God in Kannada Literature*, pp. 6-7, Bhavans Publications, Bombay, 1960.
2. Sri Kumaraswamiji: *The Viśiṣṭa Philosophy and Mysticism*, pp. 1-2, Dharmwar, 1949
3. (i) The *Taittirīya Upaniṣad*, 1.8. (ii) *Akṣara* means both syllable and imperishable, i.e. Brahman. The *Upaniṣad*, pt. I. p.1. Tr. Max Müller, Dovers Publication, 1962.

It is also explained as Parabrahma and Īśvara<sup>4</sup> in the *Māṇḍūkya*. The creative energy of Parabrahma is Īśvara<sup>5</sup> in *Śvetāśvatara*. Īśvara, or Śakti, is an aspect of Parabrahma. Hara is *akṣara* (word or syllable)<sup>6</sup>. Hara is endowed with *māyā*<sup>7</sup>. So is *śabda*<sup>8</sup>. As the cosmos is the work of the possessor of *māyā*, it was *śabda* that created it.<sup>9</sup> This is the metaphysics of the *śabda* in the *Upaniṣads*.

The second sense of the word *śabda* is in the mystical, it is a process of purification and contemplation with which one is able to realise God within oneself.<sup>10</sup> *Śabda* is a way and the goal as well.<sup>11</sup> There are two distinct ways: one, that enables one to realise the self as immanent, namely *śabda*, and the other that leads to the realisation of the self as transcendent, namely *niśśabda*. The word (*śabda*) is sound in two senses: *anāhataśabda* and *hataśabda*, or a ethereal and non-ethereal. Thus *śabda* also is the essence of the Upanishadic mystical teaching.

'The word' in the *Bible* is said to be with God as well as God. The word became flesh. Similarly, in the *Qur'ān* the word is power as it is in Christology, where *logos* is used in the sense of creative energy. But word as the power of Allah is quite different from power in Christianity, as it means the fiat of Allah. Thus the Qu'ranic and Biblical connotations differ.<sup>12</sup> Christian mysticism as well as Sufi mysticism diverge from their texts in their view of the nature of God and creation as well as their natural relation. The *logos* in Greek or Christian philosophy and the *logos* in Upanishadic philosophy are analogous but not identical. The *logos* in the Upanishadic philosophy plays a subservient and secondary part to the Ātman.<sup>13</sup> There are various senses of the word in the *Bible*, *Qur'ān* and *Upaniṣads*.

We could now trace the relation between the Upanishadic and Vacanāgamic doctrine of the *śabda*. *Śabda* in the *Śūnyasampādane*

4. *praṇavo hy aparaṁ brahma praṇavaś ca paraṁ smṛtaḥ*, *Māṇḍūkya-Up-Kārikā*, I 26.

5. See note to the *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, I.3. Rāmakiṣṇāśrama, Mysore, 1962.

6. The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, I. 10.

7. *ibid.* IV. 10.

8. *na śivaḥ śaktirahito na śaktiḥ śivavarjitaḥ* - The *Matāṅgapārameśvarāgama*.

9. (i) The creation is *māyā*, in its original sense of the work, then of phenomena, then of illusion. The *Upaniṣads*, pt. II, xxxvi. Tr. Max Müller.  
(ii) The *Śvetāśvataropaniṣad*, IV. 9.

10. Dr. R.D. Ranade: *A Constructive Survey of Upanishadic Philosophy*, p. 342, Oriental Books Agency, 1926.

11. The *Kāthopaniṣad*

12. Dr. R.C. Zachner: *Comparison of Religions*, pp. 198-203, Beacon Paper Back 1962.

13. Dr. R.D. Ranade: *op. cit.* p. 95.

means *Liṅga*, the highest Reality, as in the *Upaniṣads*. Goheśvara is the word;<sup>14</sup> Goheśvara is *Liṅga*. Therefore the word is *Liṅga*. *Liṅga* is the source and the place to which ultimately everything returns, or the principle in which everything disappears.<sup>15</sup> *Śabda*, again, is *Mahāliṅga*.<sup>16</sup> *Mahāliṅga* is a condition of the beginning of cosmic creation. It is also said to be *sadākhyā*<sup>17</sup> which means the beginning of the Existence (sat-hood). *Mahāliṅga* may be compared to Hiraṇyagarbha, or the cosmic-man in the *Upaniṣad* and to the *logos* among the Greeks. *Mahāliṅga* is the conscious force, or *śaraṇa*. Hence *śaraṇa*, *cit* and *śabda* are synonyms. *Cit* was born in the Formless, or Void so that the Formless might not remain in the same state.<sup>18</sup> This is Its sport. 'O' is Formless. 'Om' is Form.<sup>19</sup> To put the same either in the words of the *Rgveda* or *Taittirīyāranyaka* or *Taittirīyopaniṣad*, *cit* (*śabda*) is born of the Formless, or *asat*. *Cit* is form. It is in the words of Aristotle, the *potentia* becoming actual. As *cit* is form and *cit* is *śabda*, *śabda* is form. *Śabda* and *niśśabda* are form and the formless. When we say that *niśśabda* is beyond the grasp of the intellect or word (i.e. *śabda*), we mean thereby that it is the formless. It defies words as does the *asat* of the *Rgveda*. As *cit*, the first germ of mind, was born in the *asat* of the *Rgveda*<sup>20</sup>, as was *śabda* (i.e. *cit*) born in *niśśabda* which is Parabrahma of *Vacana* literature. This is as good as saying that *sat* was born in *asat*. *Śabda*, therefore, as matter with power to become many-formed, is the world of multiplicity. So *śabda* (idea) is dominated by *māyā* as Kant alludes.<sup>21</sup>

The mystical senses of *śabda* and *niśśabda* are found on the metaphysics of *śabda* and *niśśabda*. *Śabda* is *mahadahānāra* in *Niśśabda-brahma*.<sup>22</sup> It is the beginning of *samsāra*, that is, ignorance. It is *śabdasaṃdāni*, 'empirical existence'. The emancipation consists in the process of changing *śabda* into *niśśabda*. This consists of two lores,

14. The *Śūnyasampādane*, I. 72. Ed. Prof. S.S. Bhusnoomath, Kallumath, Adwani, 1958.

15. The *Siddhāntaśikhāmaṇi*, VI. 37. And an Agamic stanza quoted to support VI. 37 by N.R. Karibasavasastri, 1914.

16. Dr. R.C. Hiremath: The *Ṣaṭsthalajñānasārāmṛta*, pp. 18-19 v. 33, Murughamath, Dharwar, 1964.

17. *ibid.* p. 153.

18. (i) The *Śūnyasampādane*, VIII. 25; VII. 24. (ii) The *Ṣaṭsthalajñānasārāmṛta*, pp. 22-23. v. 38. (iii) Prof. S.S. Bhusnoomath: The *Parāmarse*, p. 550, Kallumath, Adwani, 1969.

19. The *Śūnyasampādane*, XIII. 18.

20. The *Rgveda*, X. 129. 1.

21. Dr. C.G. Jung: *The Psychological Types*, p. 59, Kegan and Paul, 1933.

22. The *Śūnyasampādane*, VIII. 26.

namely Śabdabrahma and Nīśabdabrahma. These two lores presuppose two types of enlightenment: one, due to the word from without; and the other, due to the word from within.<sup>23</sup> The enlightenment from without is Śabdabrahma which is being advocated and practised by almost all the schools, since it still accepts the duality of subject and object. We have the counterpart of it in the *Veda*. The *śabdavidyā* taught in the *Veda* is a first step to the *nīśabdavidyā* of the *Upaniṣads*.<sup>24</sup> The emphasis here has shifted from objectivism to subjectivism in the sphere of lore as in the sphere of metaphysics. The light that comes from without is subordinated to the light within. Even the masterhood and discipleship which belong to the plane of mind, recognised in the text under study, was challenged by Prabhu, on the ground that there lingers the *ulīhu* (noise) of the word. This is still the psychological plane. There is still a higher plane which is not psychological and moral. To know thy self represents the psychological plane and to know thyself by thyself represents the metaphysical plane. This contrast is shown by Prof. Max Müller.<sup>25</sup> This disappears when the plane of the Self is reached where there is no witness.<sup>26</sup> This is the plane of Nīśabdabrahma. The lore to be followed to attain the Nīśabdabrahma is *nīśabdavidyā* substituted for the *śabdavidyā*, which has entered the sphere of subjectivity from that of objectivity. The discourse on subtler and more subtle forms that occurs in the text is thrilling. The subtlest nature of the *śabda* category in the form of enlightenment is challenged by Prabhu even when it performed the function from within. This is a psychological problem: a problem of subject and predicate in modern psychology. The argument affirms the duality. The synthesis is reached on a higher plane. The text suggests that the *sākāra* (*śabda* from without) and the *nirākāra* (*śabda* from within) are two forms of duality or ignorance. *Nirākāra* is the subtler form. It is just the brilliant golden lid that covered the face of Truth, according to the expression of the *Upaniṣad*.<sup>27</sup> This golden lid is removed when the nature and function of *nirākāra* (i.e. *guru* in the form of inward enlightenment and its consciousness) is seen to be a subtler form of *sākāra*,<sup>28</sup> which is *śabda* that represents the 'I-ness' and 'otherness' (*tānu* and *iduru*) in the subject.

23. *ibid.* II. 23-26.

24. *Śrī Aurobindo on Tantra*, p. 38. ed. Pandit. M.P., Sri Aurobindo Asrama, Pondicherry, 1964.

25. Max Müller: *A History of Ancient Sanskrit Literature*, p. 11. Major Basu Bhuvaneshwari Asrama, Allahabad, 1859.

26. The *Śūnyasampādane*, II. 22.

27. The *Isopaniṣad*, 15.

28. The *Śūnyasampādane* II. 26.

According to the text, a stage is reached where the words in mystic experience become an impediment, and their rejection is advised. The ineffability of the mystic experience is the hall-mark of all the systems of the world mysticism. The *Upaniṣad* and *Śūnyasampādana* mean that the word, i.e. mind, has no capacity to understand the Reality, when they say *no cakṣuṣā gr̥hyate nāpi vācā*,<sup>29</sup> etc., and *nuḍiṃya gaḍaṇake silukuvude niśśabda brahma?* That *śabda* stands for the psychic entity<sup>30</sup> is a very ancient notion in Indian philosophy<sup>31</sup>. *Śabda*, in the sense of mind or psychic entity, implies the multiplicity of the world.<sup>32</sup> It is a realm of percepts and concepts which is *śabdasandāni*. Realisation is the cessation of the *śabda*. This is a state of *niśśabda*.<sup>33</sup> This is the mystic experience that lies beyond the *śabda* principle. So the Buddha kept silent over the mystic experience. So did Ajaganna and Maruḷasaṅkara. The masters in the field state that if one tries to describe the experience one will lose it. Therefore it is wise to remain silent.<sup>34</sup> The mystics naturally practised silence. This poses a problem to a student who is inspired by the spirit of inquiry. Allamaprabhu is such an enlightened inquirer who held the investigation in collaboration with Muktāyaka.

The investigation begins in two directions. The beginning of the investigation in the direction of Yoga psychology is one phase of the problem of *śabda* and *niśśabda*. The ideal, namely *niśśabda*, is *yoga*. *Niśśabda* is attained in almost all the schools of thought. The disappearance of *śabdasandāni* (multiplicity in mind) in different schools has different metaphysical bases. Therefore the mystic experience of the Buddha, of Patañjali – the author of the *Yogasūtra*, of Jaigīṣavya – the author of the *Dhāraṇaśāstra*<sup>35</sup> which was rejected by the Buddha and accepted by Hīnayāna<sup>36</sup> and of the Śaṣṭhala school differ. The disappearance of multiplicity in

29. The *Muṇḍakopaniṣad*, III. i. 8.

30. The *Śatapathabrāhmaṇa*, XIV. 6.2.11; The *Śūnyasampādana*, II. 36; The *Chāndogyaopaniṣad*, I. 1. 2.

31. Prof. M. Hiriyanna: *Outlines of Indian Philosophy*, p. 139 George Allen and Unwin, 1958.

32. Dr. H. Oldenberg: *Buddha*, p. 446. The Book Co. Ltd., Calcutta, 1927.

33. The *Śūnyasampādana*.

34. The *Sarvajñānavacanagalu*, St. Rv. C.D. Uttangi.

35. (i) The *Nyāyasūtra*, III 2. 43 quoted in the *Sāṃkhyakārikā*, p. 18. Dr. Mainkar Oriental Book Agency, 1964.

(ii) The Jaigīṣavya is seventh among the twenty eight *Śivayogācāryas*. This is a tradition to which Allama, Basava and others belong. (cf. Dr. L. Basavaraju *Allamanavacanacandrike*, pp. 33-35). Twenty-eighth is Lakulīśa who lived in the second cent. B.C.

36. The *Buddhacarita*, pt. II (introduction). Tr. Johnston, Punjab University.

the mind, or cessation of words, is by suppression of the senses and by controlling the agitation in the mind. The cessation of *nāma* (word) is the everlasting goal in Buddhism. This psychic entity consists of sensations, perceptions, conformation and consciousness.<sup>37</sup> Cessation of the word means cessation of all these except the pure consciousness. That is *nirvāṇa*. Therefore *nirvāṇa* is cessation of words or of continuous change in the mind. The method is metaphysical, namely *patieccasamutpada*. In Patañjali, *cittavṛtti-nirodha* is the process of stopping the agitation in the mind. This process arrests the activity of *Prakṛti* and separates the self from it. That is the mystic experience according to Patañjali. In Buddhism, the highest reality is *cit*. The mystic experience is utter silence or pure consciousness. This experience consists of the act of stopping, that is blowing out, the activity in *cit*. There is nothing in Buddhism like the *Prakṛti* of Sāṃkhya-yoga though there is corporeality. This evolves out of *cit* or psychic entity. The mystic process is emptying the *cit*.

The act of cessation of words is not suppression of the senses, in Buddhism;<sup>38</sup> whereas it is the suppression of the senses in the Yoga system of Patañjali, Jainism and the Vedāntins. The suppression is based on a metaphysical foundation. The senses in Buddhism are evolutes of the consciousness.<sup>39</sup> In Patañjali they are the evolutes of *Prakṛti*, which is a metaphysical notion in Sāṃkhya.<sup>40</sup> The senses are products of *puṭgala* or matter, in Jainism,<sup>41</sup> and are obstacles both in Jainism and Patañjali. In Vedānta, the senses are *bhautika*, as in Nyāya-vaiśeṣika whose source is *māyā*.<sup>42</sup> Therefore the rejection of matter is the ideal of the above mentioned schools except Buddhism. For them the suppression of the senses is necessary. The Śaṭṭhala school states that *indriyas* are evolutes of the five elements themselves the evolutes of the self.<sup>43</sup> The senses in the Śaṭṭhala school of thought do not belong, therefore, to the category which is not of the nature of self as in the Vedānta of Śāṅkara or Rāmānuja or M. dhva. The defect in the power of the senses has to be understood differently from system

37. Dr. H Oldenberg: op. cit. p. 447.

38. The *Buddhacarita*, pt. II. p. lxi - ii. Tr. Johnston.

39. ibid..

40. The *Sāṃkhyakārikā*,

41. The *Pañcāstikāya-sūtra* - The Prefaces, pp.38-39, Ed. K.B.Jindal, Calcutta, 1958.

42. M. Hiriyanna: op. cit. pp. 341-43.

43. *Cennābasavannanavaravacanagalu*, p.V., Ed. Dr. R.C. Hiremath, K.U. Dharwar, 1965.

to system. This depends on the category of which they are the products. So the Śaṭsthala view differs from the Jaina view. The defect in the senses according to the Śaṭsthala school is to be overcome not by punishing them, as in the Jaina system, but by sublimation. This is in accordance with the metaphysical stand taken by the Śaṭsthala school. *Śabda* is the product of the senses in the empirical sense. The mind is filled with *śabdas* as they enter from without. Therefore, to stop the agitation in the mind means the stopping of the inflow from without.

The satiated state of mind in Patañjali is a rippleless pond-like state. This state of mind involves neither loud thinking nor silent speech. This ideal is demanded by the metaphysics accepted by Patañjali in order to separate the self from the bond of *Prakṛti*. Separation of one from the other is the mystic method, and the achievement is the mystic experience in the Yoga system. Their separation involves the problem of their original coming together, which warrants an independent study. In the Śaṭsthala school, the goal is not separation of *aṅga* and *liṅga*, but bringing them together, which is quite an opposite process. Therefore, *yoga* in the Śaṭsthala school is not *viyoga* as in the Yoga school. Separation of self from *Prakṛti* leads to inaction. This is silence in Patañjali. Cessation of words in Buddhism is breaking of the twelvefold link. It is the state of pure consciousness. This pure state is called *niśśabda*. The union of *aṅga* and *liṅga*, according to the Śaṭsthala school of thought, is the state where absence of words prevails. It is a condition for the release of grace, or the higher power, after which the activity of the senses is inspired by *liṅga*. The mind-seed which so far motivated the activity of senses is now replaced by the *liṅga*-seed. Now the internal and the external senses are those of Divine. Therefore, the senses cannot any longer produce *śabda* but only *niśśabda*. This *niśśabda* is quite different from the dead silence that is produced by the yogic process in Patañjali or the dumbness of the Buddha in the mystic experience. Therefore *niśśabda* represents quite a different category in the Śaṭsthala school. In this stage, *niśśabda* is the activity of the senses when *liṅga* unites with the *aṅga*<sup>44</sup>. At this stage, *niśśabda* is also termed *śabda*. *Śabda* (i.e. *niśśabda*) of the *Śaraṇa* differs from that of the unrealised man because of the difference of categories. In other words it is the difference of *svara*. The word of the *Śaraṇa* is said to be effulgent *liṅga*; whereas the word of man is mind. Ineffability is one of the characteristics of the mystic experience. The Śaṭsthala school however differs from the rest of the mystic schools in this regard. For the mystic here, accepts a different category. Ineffability for him would be



inability of mind and, therefore, represents a mental category. In the Śaṭsthala school *nīśśabda* represents a category of the self. Thus *śabda* and *nīśśabda* represent two categories. Hence the word, or sound of the *Śaraṇa*, *śabda* or *nīśśabda* is the highest principle.<sup>44</sup>

---

45. *ibid.* II. 20.

Dr. D.N. SUKLA

## THE SOUTH INDIAN CONTRIBUTIONS IN ART AND ARCHITECTURE

The Indian art-cum-architecture, i.e. temple art-cum-architecture has been tackled by a good many scholars like Fergusson, Marshall, Hevell, Brown and others under the archaeological convictions.<sup>1</sup> These European savants, however, could not grasp the fundamental foundations and canons of Temple art and architecture. Further a good many eminent historians have concluded that the Indian Aryans were a pastoral race. They were more foresters rather than townsman. The Aryans were more interested in simple living and high thinking. The word *āśrama* also testifies this contention. Out of the three *āśramas*, *brahmacarya*, *vānaprastha* and *saṁnyāsa*—all these were related to forests, the secluded and sacred places – the sacred banks of the sacred rivers, the calm and quite atmosphere, the perennial and permanent peaceful environment. Even the great ancient Universities – the *Gurukulas*, the *Ṛṣikulas* all were situated in the midst of the forests and on the rivers – this is the basic review of the Aryan life and culture. The non-Aryans – the original dwellers of this ancient land – the Asuras, the Nāgas, the Drāviḍas were the great builders, the great sculptors and the great artisans. When commingling of the two great cultures during the post-Vedic period, i.e. of Aryans and non-Aryans, emerged, a synthesis, i.e. an amalgamation took place and thus it is not possible to earmark the Aryan and the non-Aryan traits. This composite culture of India needs a great and painstaking research. But, I forward the following few new lights with documentary evidences as enshrined in Śilpa-texts.

The South Indian Temple-art-architecture is evaluated later than North Indian temple-building, i.e. Gupta-temples like Bhitargaon

1. A new light on this subject was thrown in the mammoth gathering at Elliyathan-gudi Sadas of Śilpi-āgama-tantra as founded by Jagadguru Swami Sankaracharya of Kāmakotīpīṭham, Kanchinuram

temple which is the oldest specimen of temple-art-architecture pertaining to the Northern India, i.e. Nagara school of Architecture.

The Vedic altar is the mother of Temple-building art and architecture. The *Sulba-sūtras* are the founders of this art where brick-making, brick-laying, brick-shapes and brick-measurements, etc., are fully codified. Vedic altar is invoked as 'Godhead' – Yajña-nārāyaṇa. Similarly, the further devotional places like *prāsādas*, the *vimānas* were equally sanctified as God-head. The *vimāna* is the first and foremost architypal type of the temple architecture. The *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra* (SS) has given a documentary and certified testimony of this origin and development of Temple genesis from the *vimānas* :

*vimānam atha vakṣyāmaḥ prāsādaṁ sambhuvallabham |*  
*svargapātālamariyānāṁ trayāṇāṁ api bhūṣṇam ||*

*sarveṣāṁ gṛhavāstūnāṁ prāsādānāṁ ca sarvaṭḥ |*  
*prāsādo mūlabhūto 'yaṁ tathā ca parikarmaṇāṁ ||*

*purā brahmāṣṭṛjat pañca vimānāny asuradviṣāṁ |*  
*viyadvarimavicāriṇi śrīmanti ca mahanti ca ||*

*tāni vairāja kailāse puṣpakam maṇikābhīdham |*  
*haimāni maṇicitrāṇi pañcamāṁ ca triviṣṭapam ||*

*ātmanaḥ śūlahastasya dhanādhyakṣasya pāśinaḥ |*  
*sureśine ca viśveṣo vimānāni yathākramam ||*

*bahūny anyāni caivaṁ sa sūryādīnāṁ akalpayat |*  
*vīṣeṣya yathoktaḥ tāny ākārāni pratidaivatam ||*

*prāsādāś ca tadākārān śilāpakveṣṭakādibhiḥ |*  
*nagarāṇāṁ alaṅkārahetave samakalpayat ||*

*vairājaṁ caturāśraṁ syād vṛttaṁ kailāsasaṁjñitam |*  
*caturāśrayatākāraṁ vimānam puṣpakam bhavet ||*

*vṛttāyatam ca maṇikam aṣṭāśri syāt triviṣṭapam |*  
*tadbhedān śrīmato 'nyāṁś ca vividhān aṣṭṛjat prabhuḥ ||*

*athātaḥ sampravakṣyāmi prāsādān śikharānvitān |*  
*rūcakādīṁś catuḥṣaṣṭīṁ nāmalakṣaṇataḥ kramāt ||*

*pūrvam yāni vimānāni pañcoktāny abhavaṁstataḥ |*  
*tadākārabhṛtaḥ sarvam prāsādāḥ pañcaviṁśatiḥ ||*

This means that the *Vimāna*-building was the prototype of the *Prāsāda*. The five shapes of the *Vimānas* (Dravidian temples) were the

models after which the *Prāsādas* were created.<sup>2</sup> SS further says that the building models of chariots, i.e. *vimāna*, very common in the early architecture as founded by Brahmā and later expounded by Maya, were adopted as the models for the temple architecture known as *prāsādas* which cannot be doubted.

Again Dr. Ramaniya in his book *Origin of South Indian Temples* made a very fine case for the *Vimānas* as the earliest buildings in the South. Moreover, the images were both *cala* and *acala*, and the carries of the *cala* ones were chariots. Therefore, the chariots in their movements are likened to temples. Added to this the Southern *Vāstu-vidyā* and the architecture, i.e. *kalā* thereof is earlier than its Northern counterpart, is based on the origin and evolution of the stone architecture, especially with relation to the temple architecture in India. Though as per reference in the *Ṛg-veda*, the epics and the *Jātakas* (H.A.I.A.), the stone architecture was not unknown in India, it was not associated with Aryans. Dr. T P. Bhattacharya (vide; *Canons of Indian Architecture*, Ch. XXVIII) maintains that it was the Asuras (Dravidians or Dānavas) and the Nāgas (cf. also the view of the late Dr. Jayaswalā who attributed the origin of Nāgara architecture-stone architecture to Bharaśiva Nāgas) who helped the development of stone architecture in India. He further maintains that stone houses were in early days erected by the Asuras and Nāgas, the Asuras of the *Ṛg-veda* period, the Nāgas and Asuras of Taila, the capital of Nagnajit and the Asuras and Nāgas of Eastern India mentioned in the *Śatapatha brāhmaṇa* and Buddhist traditions. The introduction of the cult of image-worship among the Aryans was the barbing of the adoption of the stone architecture among them. It is our common knowledge that originally the Aryan houses were simple, built of wood and mud. Even when they adopted the cult of worship the places where they kept their deities were the ordinary houses. They called their temples, the house of the

2. Dr. Tarapada Bhattacharya, however, condemns this most authentic tradition. He says (cf. *Canons of Vāstu-vidyā*, 271), "This tradition must have originated in a late period due to the confusion in the two meanings of *vimānas* on the one hand, and the meaning of the words *prāsāda* and *vimāna* on the other. No reliance can, therefore, be placed on these later writers on Vāstu who could not distinguish between a *prāsāda*, *harmya*, *vimāna*, etc."

With all due humility I must say that the down right condemnation is uncalled for. Dr. Bhattacharya (cf. *ibid.* 270) while explaining the term, *vimāna*, has accepted the meaning of 'chariot', on the authority of the earliest known lexicographer, Amara. Again the learned Doctor while elaborating the two principal schools of Architecture—*Drāvida-vāstu-vidyā* and the *Nāgara-vāstu-vidyā*, has himself located Brahmā among the foremost earliest writers on the Drāvida Architecture, the complete list being, Brahmā, Śakra, Śukra, Maya, Bhṛgu, Bṛhaspati, Nagnajit and Agastya (206).

gods, *devāgāra*, *devatāyatana*, *devagrha*, *devakula*, etc., all indicative of the fact that they were nothing but the replicas of the residential houses. With the introduction of the stone architecture, these temples got the name of *mandira*, as the *Viśvakarma-prakāśa* (IV.13), defines it as temples of stone.

Previous writers have posed questions on the antiquity and origin of Indian architecture. But, I think, it is a needless attempt. Indian culture being historic rather than historical baffles the attempt. Architecture, being one of the hall-marks of civilization, must have begun with rise of civilization. The finds at Mohenjo-daro and Harappa which represents a very advanced state of architectural objects cannot be disregarded of their historical value. Rigvedic allusions and references to a very advanced state of architecture also cannot be called imaginary. Therefore, the origin is not only a problem but also a mystery, and modern rationalism is all against a mysterious approach. A scientific approach in relation to an architectural study must not be based solely on archaeological evidences. The literary evidences must have an equal importance in reconstructing our past history despite the absence of any archaeological evidence. Architecture as mirrored in the hymns of *Rgveda* is a pointer. There are innumerable references in *Rgveda* which indicate a very advanced architecture of the day.<sup>3</sup>

In the first, Vasiṣṭha desired to have a three storeyed dwelling (*tridhātu-śaraṇam*); in the second is the reference to a sovereign who sits down in his substantial and elegant hall built with a thousand pillars and the third alludes to residential houses with such pillars and said to be vast, comprehensive and thousand-doored and lastly in the fifth Mitra and Varuṇa are represented as occupying a great palace with a thousand pillars and a thousand gates. These are evidently spacious halls, the chief characteristic of which is abundant pillars. There are several expressions (cf. the one in the above quotations—*tridhātu*) in the *Rgveda* which have been explained by Sāyaṇa as referring to many-storeyed houses.

*Puras* or towns and their fortification, namely words like *durgāni*, *asmayāsi*, *śatabhujī* in the following quotations would give you a picture of the strong cities or forts. Similarly there are good many references and allusions to so many other objects.<sup>4</sup>

3. RV (Wilson), IV. 148.200; II. 313; II. 41.5; IV. 179; V. 62.6, etc.

4. Cf. RV. I. 58.8, 144.1; II. 20.8; IV. 27.1; 37.20, VII. 3.7; 15.14; 89.8; 95.1 and cf. also *Some aspects of earliest History of India* by S.C. Sarkar, p. 19.

Let us now peep into the finds especially connected with buildings as discovered in the excavations at Mohenjodaro and Harappa. 'The buildings discovered at the different strata at Mohenjo-daro may be classified under the following heads: (1) dwelling-houses, (2) public baths of religious or secular character, (3) temples of some kind, and (4) raised platforms, possibly tombs'. Dr. Acharya refers to two buildings which bear all the essential features of a Hindu temple: "There is the little building containing two chambers, one much larger than the other with a corridor at the side, and there is the larger structure, which comprises a large central chamber with a corridor on its western and southern sides, a well and two other small chambers at its southern end, and a group of somewhat larger chambers at its northern, the original plan of which is obscured beneath latter accretions. Little, unfortunately is left of this interesting ruin except its foundations, but these are unusually massive, nearly ten feet deep with a solid filling of crude brick, and presuppose a correspondingly high superstructure, which might very well have taken the form of a corbelled *śikhara* over the central apartment. One without a pre-conceived idea but familiar with the common features of a Hindu temple, would feel no difficulty in identifying the above buildings as ordinary shrines, with a central room where a deity or an emblem is installed, with necessary side rooms and corridors, and finally, surmounted with a *śikhara*'.

'The inhabitants of Harappa appear also to have been in the habit of offering in their temples terra-cotta cones with or without figures of animals of which several specimen have been recovered'. Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni also is inclined to think that 'a large cone of dark stone, eleven inches high resembling the Śiva-līṅga of modern times, must have been used for worship. Concerning the existence of the temples at Harappa, Sir John Marshall does not seem to have any doubt. Summarising the account of Sahni, Marshall declares that the temples stand on elevated ground and are distinguished by the relative smallness of their chambers and the exceptional thickness of their walls—which suggest that they were several storeys in height. To a temple, also, doubtless belongs the spacious courtyard with chapels or other apartments on its four sides.

In the light of these observations there are several scholars notably Marshall, Chanda and others who surmise that inhabitants of Harappa and Mohenjo-daro were really the pre-Aryan, probably Dravidian people of India, known in the *Vedas* as Dasyus or Asuras, whose culture was largely destroyed by the invading Aryans. Here is noted (RV 4.30. 20) that Indra overthrew a hundred *puras* for his worshipper Divodas. If Rigvedic Aryans do not record any cultural

influence of these pre-Vedic people on their mode of living and thought it was only natural because the animosity between the invading Aryans and the original inhabitants of India, including those of the Indus valley and farther south and the extreme east, was of such a nature that the former destroyed all the towns, cities (*pur*, *pura*) and forts (*durga*) of the latter.<sup>5</sup>

The Asuras were phallic worshippers and the allusions to the Śisna-devas or Mūra-devas in the *Ṛgveda* also support the aforesaid hypothesis in view of the abundant material evidences found in the finds of Harappa and Mohenjo-daro. Rai Bahadur Daya Ram Sahni supports this conclusion.<sup>6</sup> Asuras or non-Aryans or Dravidians gave birth to what may be called the Maya school of architecture. The texts like the *Mānasāra* and the *Mayamata* particularly the former may be taken to mirror and epitomize this school. The elaborations and advanced state of buildings like *vimānas* and *gopuras* may be later interpolations.<sup>7</sup> The ancient *śilpa* texts, compiled long after the artistic traditions, and got a foot-hold, could not remain isolated. They also grew and developed to mirror in them all the later phases of the evolution and development of art. Hence if the Asura architecture is earlier than the Vedic art, we have no alternative but to recognise the earlier antiquity of Dravidian style. The paucity of finds and specimens of *vimānas* – buildings as described in these texts cannot stand in our way to formulate a working hypothesis.

- 
5. There are some other scholars (cf. J.G. Ghosh, *Indian Culture*, vol. VI) who consider Vedic Architecture as referred to, from many allusions in the hymns and the *Yajus*, as fairly advanced and the strong cities or forts described in them, refer to those of the Asuras who may be identified with Assyrians who were certainly more advanced in their architectural traditions than the Vedic Aryans who were more foresters and villagers than citizens of big cities with ditches and rampart around.
  6. Vide: *Archaeological Survey of India Report*, 1924-25, p. 74.
  7. Interpolations are usual in India practically with all classes of ancient literature, the epics (especially the greater one), the *Purāṇas* and other allied classes of literature.

## PRINCIPAL SENTIMENT IN THE UTTARARĀMACARITA

*mṛdulalitapadārthaṃ gūḍhaśabdārthahīnaṃ  
janapadasukhabhogyam yuktiman nṛtayoḥjyam |  
bahukṛtarasamārgaṃ sandhisandhānayuktam  
bhavati jagati yogyaṃ nāṭakam prekṣakāṇām ||*

*Nāṭyaśāstra*, 16 128.

While he defines the term *nāṭaka* in his *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, Viśva-nātha states, "Either *śṛṅgāra* or *vīra* should be made the principal sentiment and all other sentiments can come as subsidiaries that support the development of the principal sentiment".<sup>1</sup> Similar is the view of Dhanañjaya in his *Daśarūpaka*.<sup>2</sup> This is not surprising in view of the fact that (i) love and heroism have been the dominant sentiments in the lives of the great men of the history of old, (ii) the dominant place of love and heroism cannot be denied in the lives of man even to-day in every nook and corner of the world, (iii) almost all the Sanskrit dramatists, who wrote in the *nāṭaka* form have accepted either love or heroism as the dominant sentiment. Sanskrit *nāṭaka* is thus more or less faithful to life when it is stated that love and heroism should reign as the principal sentiments in *nāṭaka*, the best of the forms of drama in Sanskrit and, therefore, the most experimented upon by poets. Even though Sanskrit drama and its *nāṭaka* form do not lack in so many situations of unparalleled *karuṇa*, *karuṇa* is not recognised as a sentiment as important as *śṛṅgāra* or *vīra* in the works on dramaturgy when the

---

1. *eka eva bhaved aṅgī śṛṅgāro vīra eva vā |  
aṅgam anye rasāḥ sarve kāryo nirvahane 'dbhutaḥ ||* VI. 10.

2. *eko raso 'iṅgikartavyo vīraḥ śṛṅgāra eva vā |  
aṅgam anye rasāḥ sarve kuryān nirvahane 'dbhutaḥ |* III. 33-34.



writers of these works treat of the nine *rasas*<sup>5</sup> with which the works of poetry and drama are to be enriched. Dhanañjaya treats of this sentiment as the last one in his famous work.<sup>4</sup> One question has raised several very much interesting controvercies with regard to the *Uttararāmacarita*. While a majority of critics and scholars state that *karuṇa* is the principal and the dominant sentiment in the drama, the fact stands that the drama ends in the reunion of Rāma and Sītā after their love has been universalised and the utter keenness of Rāma and Sītā for reunion has been approved of by the people and the whole world and again, it is *śṛṅgāra* and not *karuṇa* that specifically and systematically develops through the story to come to the culmination of reunion, i.e. all the desired stages of the development of love are to be found with *śṛṅgāra* and not *karuṇa*. This raises doubts with regard to the propriety of the acceptance of the theory of the scholars that *karuṇa* is the principal sentiment, even Bhavabhūti himself also proclaims that the only sentiment worth the name is *karuṇa* and all others are its subsidiaries and varied forms. The new and original sentiment comes from his pen when he is actually carried away by the very powerful overflow of the sentiment of *karuṇa* created by him in the third act, for which it has rightly been stated that if the reader of the third act does not weep, then he is either a god or an animal. The fact also stands that no other writer of *nāṭaka* accepts this sentiment as the principal one even though *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*<sup>6</sup> accepts the possibility of any of the sentiments becoming the principal sentiment in the *nāṭaka*, while just stressing with all others that the sentiment at the end shall invariably be *adbhuta*.<sup>6</sup> Thus, the position in the matter comes to this :-

(1) While failing to remain far above the pathos of the situation created by him, as it should have happened with him as a great writer, Bhavabhūti proclaims that the only sentiment worth the name is *karuṇa*<sup>7</sup>

3. Vide:

*śṛṅgārahāsyakaruṇaraudravīrabhayānakāḥ |*  
*bhībhato 'dbhuta ity aṣṭau śānto 'pi navamo rasaḥ ||*

4. *Kārikās* IV. 81 & 82.

5. *ekāṅgirasam anyāṅgam adbhutāntam rasormibhiḥ |*  
*alaṅghitam alaṅkāra-kathāṅgair agalad rasam ||* I. 15.  
and

*nāṭakam hi sarvarasam kevalam eko 'ṅgī tadapare gauṇāḥ |*

6. *kā'yo nirvahaṇe 'dbhutaḥ, Sāhityadarpaṇa ;*  
*kuryān nirvahaṇe 'dbhutam, Daśarūpaka ;*  
*adbhutāntam rasormibhiḥ, Nāṭyadarpaṇa, I. 15.*

7. cf. *eko rasaḥ karuṇa eva nimittabhedād*  
*bhinnaḥ prthak prthag ivāśrayate vivartān |* *Uttararāmacarita, III. 47.*

and thus he also seems to suggest that *karuṇa* is the principal sentiment in the drama.

(2) The whole drama, right from the beginning to the end is clearly and completely pervaded by the sentiment of *karuṇa*.

(3) A large majority of critics state that *karuṇa* is the principal sentiment in the drama.

On the other side,

(1) Sanskrit dramatic technique developed by Viśvanātha and Dhanañjaya on the basis of the dramas written in their days and on the basis of the best works in the form, specifically states that *śṛṅgāra* and *vīra*<sup>8</sup> and not *karuṇa* should be the principal sentiment in the *nāṭaka* form.

(2) No such controversy exists with regard to any other drama of the *nāṭaka* form in Sanskrit and all have accepted the theory of Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha.

(3) The *Uttararāmacarita* begins and ends in *śṛṅgāra* and not *karuṇa*, the drama is a comedy and not a tragedy.

(4) It is an accepted principle that the sentiment that claims to be the principal one in *nāṭaka* must specifically and systematically develop through the drama.<sup>9</sup>

Now, our question is this. What is the real position with regard to the principal sentiment in the drama? Is the *rasa śṛṅgāra* or *karuṇa* or some other one? Before we hurry into a conclusion, the problem needs to be studied from all points of view. This will also necessitate the study of the views of all important scholars and that too not only from just the points of view accepted by them but also or probably only from the point of view accepted by Bhavabhūti when he composed this work for which it has rightly been stated that, *uttare rāmucarite bhavabhūtiḥ viśiṣyate*, 'Bhavabhūti excels and shows his excellent art in the *Uttararāmacarita*'. Incidentally, the solution of this problem will help us in solving many other problems regarding Bhavabhūti's view of life, his pessimism or otherwise, art, poetry, dramatic technique, etc.

8. Vide for 1 & 2 above.

9. *vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāribhāvād rasaniṣpattiḥ*, Bharata also *Nāṭyaśāstra* VII. 1. Vide: *Daśarūpa*, IV. 1. and *Sāhityadarpaṇa* III. 1.

### A brief study of the drama

Getting a clear idea about the controversy necessitates that we study in brief the story of Rāma as Bhavabhūti has depicted it. The drama is named *Uttararāmacarita*, 'latter life of Rāma', not a very much inspiring title and not a title that throws light on the problem. It opens with the act that is one of the best pieces of literary art and poetry in Sanskrit, the famous *ālekhyadarśana*, 'the picture gallery scene.' It is exquisitely beautiful with its lofty poetry and excellent dramatic effect. This act reveals how Rāma very anxiously and carefully tries to wipe out the taint of pain and dissatisfaction from the heart of his beloved Sītā, whom he, as the king to be, forced to undergo the fire-ordeal to prove her purity, on account of the flimsiness of the people of the world who are difficult to be pleased<sup>10</sup> and wicked with regard to the purity of woman.<sup>11</sup> It is a touching fine picture of mature love that is unique in its own way in so far as the pair of Rāma and Sītā has been the finest and most ideal pair of married love known to Hindu culture.<sup>12</sup> Rāma and Sītā in fact embody the best and the noblest that the Hindu culture can give. In this act, as Rāma tries to assure Sītā that he was not at fault for all that he forced on her. Sītā states that she is not sorry for all that has happened and she states that *bhavatu, āryaputra bhavatu. ehi. prekṣāmahe tāvat te caritam*. This is hardly convincing and poor consolation to Rāma who knows that she is not reconciled to the worst of insults that the noblest of women is subjected to, suspicion about her purity of character. Rāma tries more and more to please Sītā and treats her in the most delicate and loving way and at the same time proclaims that

*snehaṃ dayāṃ ca saukhyaṃ ca yadi vā jñanakīm api |  
ārāadhanāya lokasya muñcato nāsti me vyathā ||*<sup>13</sup>

"I would not experience pain even if I were to sacrifice love, pity, friendship, nay, even Jānakī for the sake of the pleasure of my subjects." And Sītā compliments him for this unique attitude. This clearly shows what Rāma, the king, stands for and Sītā is proud of her husband and lover for this. But, this was easier said than done because, to Rāma, Sītā was,

10. *kliṣṭo janaḥ kuladhanair anurāñjanīyaḥ*, *Uttara*. I. 14.

11. *yathā strīṇāṃ tathā vācāṃ sādhitve durjano janaḥ*. *ibid*. I. 5.

12. 'The prevailing *rasa* is *karuṇa* or pathos, which has for its background love – not youthful love, which is apt to be tinged with sensuality, but mature love between two souls that have passed through chastening sorrow and suffering', Hiriyanā: *Sanskrit Studies*, p. 44.

13. *Uttara*: I. 12.

*iyam gehe lakṣmīr iyam amṛtavartir nayanayor  
asāv asyāḥ sparśaḥ vapuṣi bahulaś candanarasaḥ |  
ayam bāhuḥ kaṇṭhe śīśīramasṛṣṇo mauktikasaraḥ  
kim asyā na preyo yadi param asahyas tu virahaḥ ||*<sup>14</sup>

‘She is the Goddess of my house, a streak of nectar to my eyes, this her touch is deep annointment of *candana-rasa* to my limbs, this hand round the neck is cool and smooth like a pearl-necklace,’ and it is, therefore, quite natural for Rāma to feel that ‘what is not to my heart’s delight in her case if ever separation could become bearable’. ‘When Rāma expresses these deep sentiments of his heart, he is hardly ever conscious of the sorrow that is just to follow. The picture of Sītā supported by the loving hand of Rāma is a picture of love par excellence,<sup>15</sup> more so when Rāma’s heart, seated in his extremely delicate eyes expresses the above mentioned sentiments. He is prepared for anything but separation and the consequent sorrow and alas, separation and sorrow follow just at a time when Sītā is in an extremely delicate condition of advanced pregnancy and the time when she needs the care, love and caresses of her lover the most’.<sup>16</sup> It also shows that in even the mature love of Rāma and Sītā something is lacking<sup>17</sup> It is a grave limitation on the part of Rāma that he failed to convince Sītā about the necessity of the fire ordeal and also on the part of Sītā that she fails to understand Rāma and she feels pricked and deeply wounded in the heart and is not easy to reconcile, even though she knows the *vrata* of Rāma about the pleasure of the people that he ruled. The sorrow and misunderstanding between Rāma and Sītā deepens with Rāma now discarding Sītā even without caring to tell her. The scene in the first act is thus purely a scene dominated by deep love and attachment and sweetness and delicacy, over-shadowed by the sorrow already experienced and the sorrow of course due to love and the misunderstanding that is to follow shortly. It shows that Rāma and Sītā have as yet to reach that stage of love in which even a shadow of suspicion would not be allowed to exist in between and there would be the experience of unity, happiness and blessedness at perfection. Their mutual understanding in love is not yet perfect. The seed of psychological conflict is thus sown and the mutual understanding is even greater and deeper when Sītā is discarded again this time in her extremely delicate condition of advanced state of pregnancy and that too without even caring to tell her of the real state of affairs as Sītā would naturally feel. Thus, in the

14. *ibid.* I. 38.

15. Vide Rāma’s words in verses *ibid.* I. 34 to 38.

16. *ibid.* I. 43 & II. 10.

17. Hiriyanna : *op. cit.* ref fn, 12 above.

first act, even though the poet sows the seeds of the sorrow that is to follow, he clearly and specifically wants that the love between Rāma and Sītā should develop to the heights that it has not as yet scaled. Love is the theme that dominates and not *karuṇa*.

There follows a gap of six years and we now learn about the birth of two sons to Sītā and how they grew up at the hermitage of the sage Vālmīki, how Sītā has been separated even from them and has now been taken to the nether world. Then comes Rāma to kill the *śūdra* sage Śambūka for the sake of a brahmin boy<sup>18</sup> and thus, the prelude to the situation in the third act is prepared. This act also reveals the deep love of Rāma towards his beloved and tribute is paid naturally by Vāsantī to him in these words,

*vajrād api kaṭhorāṇi mṛdūni kusumād api |  
lokottarāṇām cetāṃsi ko hi vijñātum arhati ||*

‘Who can ever fathom deep into the secrets of the extraordinary hearts of noble persons, who are at heart harder than *vajra* and milder than flowers?’ The act reveals that Rāma failed to explain to Sītā the reasons why he was sending her away. He has failed her in his love for the second time. The situation, already overshadowed by sorrow and pathos, is again pervaded by further sorrow.

The third act shows to us the eternal picture of Rāma the lover, freely weeping out his heart-bound sorrows; we are an eye-witness to his acute and extremely unbearable sorrow and suffering, that grows deeper with all the last associations of his life with Sītā in the Daṇḍaka forest. He is hardly conscious that Sītā is a witness to his heart-breaking sorrow. He takes her as dead and just at this stage, *karuṇa* dominates as per definition of the *karuṇa* in the works on dramaturgy.<sup>20</sup> We quite sympathise with Rāma and quite suffer his sorrow in our own heart, when he opens his heart, he smells Sītā, is soothed by her sweet touch. It is truly stated that one who does not weep with Rāma and Sītā in the third act must be either a god or an animal but definitely not a human being. But we sympathise greater with Sītā and weep more with her. She is more or less broken because she has suffered very painful and insulting separation from her husband and also from her sons for years. Here is the illustration of the wife of Lord Rāma, who is all alone in the world, without consolation of the lover or the smooth touch and care of the

18. *śambūko nāma vṛṣalaḥ prthivyām tapyate tapaḥ |  
śiṛṣacchedyaḥ sa te rāma taṃ hatvā jīvaya dvijam ||* Uttara, II. 8.

19. *ibid.* II. 7.

20. *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 222-225;  
*Daśarūpa*, IV. 81-82; *Nāṭyadarpaṇa*, III. 14.

sons that should really be on her lap. She weeps again and again and weeps now and then. She grows unconscious again and again. With all this the nobility of her and the glory of her character are in this that she at this stage worries more about her sorrowing husband and less so about her poor self. What a tragic state she is in that she who suffers so much has to console her lover. She is thus overcome by love even in sorrow and the ruling sentiment in her case is love. She becomes an eye-witness to her husband's suffering and naturally is deeply touched by it. The scar in the heart is healed.<sup>21</sup> Rāma's tears, sighs and sorrows and sufferings have worked a wonder drug. Sītā's love rises to the highest heavenly heights. The picture is that again of love though of course overshadowed by sorrow.

From artistic points of view it seems that the drama has attained to its culmination in this act and also that it should find a natural ending in the act that is to follow. But Bhavabhūti is not satisfied by the pictures of sorrow and pathos that he has created. He gives more and more pictures of sorrow and the actual culmination of the development of love in the third act comes only in the seventh act.

The fourth act shows to us the very unhappy and humiliated mother Kausalyā, the most unfortunate mother Pṛthvī, the aggrieved and complaining Janaka and the reconciling Arundhatī – all in the hermitage with the atmosphere of love and sorrows of Rāma spreading all round. Particularly pathetic is the picture of Janaka whose steadfastness as a sage has been shaken to the very roots and also that of Kausalyā who, as the mother of Rāma naturally feels humiliated by the rash act of her son, more so in the august presence of Janaka, the father of Sītā<sup>22</sup>.

Without being detained in the fifth act in which Bhavabhūti shows his mastery over the *vīra-rasa* and which at the most prepares the ground for the arrival of Rāma in the hermitage, we pass on to the sixth act. In this act, Rāma comes to the hermitage of Vālmiki in his *puṣpaka-vimāna*. He has his first look at Lava. The very first look at

21. Vide *mohitūsmaitair āryaputravacanaiḥ*, Uttara. III. 33;  
*etenāryaputrasya durvārādārūṇārambheṇa duḥkhakṣobheṇa parimuṣṭitanijaduḥkham*  
*kim api me pramugdham*, III. 36;  
*āryaputra! sa evedānīm asi tvam*, III. 40;  
*maṣaiva dūruṇayā vipralabdhaḥ āryaputrah*, III. 42;  
*āryaputra idānīm asi tvam. aho, utkhātitaṁ me parityāgalajjūśalyam ārya-*  
*putreṇa*, III. 45;  
 and  
*dhanyā sā yaivam āryaputreṇa bahumanyate. yū cāryaputram vīrodhayanty ūś-*  
*nibandhanam jūtā jīvalokasya*, III. 45.

22. Vide. Janaka in act IV. *āḥ ko 'yam agnir asmatprasūtīparīśadhane*,

each other creates a new and a unique sensation and satisfaction in the hearts both of Rāma and Lava. It is a wonderful experience for both.<sup>23</sup> Blood relation speaks for itself, moves the very depths of the heart and all external sorrow and conflicts get merged in it. Yes, the writer is approaching the end and that is the end to make Rāma and Sītā meet in the unique fulfilment of love with their sons in the middle. Rāma, without knowing Lava and Kuśa, experiences that they are his sons. Some of the verses from the work of Vālmiki are recited by Kuśa and Sītā is remembered, nay enlivened in their midst. This is a natural approach to the seventh and the last act.

In the seventh act, Vālmiki, the poet who sang the very sad song of the life of Rāma, takes hold of the situation. Some part of his poem on Rāma, remained unpublished.<sup>24</sup> The same gets publicity today in the presence of Rāma, Lakṣmaṇa, the leaders of the people of Ayodhyā, the elders and all in the universe. Vālmiki now answers the question: what happened to Sītā after Lakṣmaṇa left her in the forest. The situation is now depicted in the form of a *garbha-nāṭika*. The purpose of this play within play is to depict the glory of the love of Rāma and Sītā, their sincerity towards each other, their unbearable sorrow, the unique purity of Sītā, and their unique love for each other and all this is being done to win over the people. The queen of Ayodhyā is purity incarnate and the love of Rāma and Sītā becomes universalised, in so far as it is now prized as a great treasure by all on earth. With the consent of the people,<sup>25</sup> Rāma and Sītā as lovers are united for all time to come.

### An Analysis – Eastern Principles

If we were to apply to this drama the Sanskrit principles of criticism, and dramaturgy, it is clear that the principal sentiment in the

23. Vide Lava in VI. 10 and  
*virodho viśrāntaḥ prasarati. raso nirvṛtighanas tadauddhatyaṃ kvāpi vrejati.*  
*vinayāḥ prahvayati mām. jhaṭitṛy asmiṃ dṛṣṭe kim iva paravān asmi* ..... VI. 11.  
 Also :  
*vyatiṣajati padārthāntaraḥ ko 'pi hetuḥ*  
*na khalu bahir upādhiṃ prīṭayāḥ saṃśrayante* | VI. 12.
24. Vide :  
 Lavaḥ : *nāyam kathāpravibhāgo 'smābhir anyena vā śrutapūrvāḥ.*  
 Janakaḥ : *kim na praṇīta eva kavinā.*  
 Lavaḥ : *praṇīto na prakāśitaḥ.*
25. Vide Lakṣmaṇa in act VII : *evam āryayārundhatyā nirbhartsitā pauraṇānapadāḥ*  
*kṛtsnāś ca bhūtagrūmaḥ āryāṃ namaskurvanti.* also Arundhati in VII. 19 :  
*jagatpate rāmacandra niyojaya yathā dharmam priyāṃ tvam dharmacārinīm.*  
*hiraṇmayyāḥ pratikṛteḥ puṇyaprakṛtim adhvare.*

drama is *śṛṅgāra* and not *karuṇa*. This is so in spite of all the excesses of the sentiment indulged into by Bhavabhūti with reference to *karuṇa* and also in spite of the fact that in his definition of *nāṭuka* in the eighteenth chapter of his *Nāṭyaśāstra*<sup>26</sup>, Bharata has not insisted upon the *śṛṅgāra* and the *karuṇa* becoming the principal sentiments and even *Nāṭyadīpana* does not refer to this.<sup>27</sup> The *karuṇarasa*, with all its excesses is just a supporting *rasa* that helps markedly universalising the love of Rāma and Sītā and thus paving the way for their final union, not only because they keenly desire it, but also because the whole world is made to desire it. The five stages of the development of the plot<sup>28</sup> of the drama develop through the first, second, third, fifth and the seventh acts. The *sandhi* are also broadly preserved. There is a specific development of the sentiment of love through the play and all the stages of it in the form of *vibhāva*, *anubhāva*, *sañcāribhāva*<sup>29</sup> and the external depiction of the *rasa* can be traced through right up to the final reunion that clearly shows that the drama ends in a comedy. Only that *rasa*, that develops specifically and clearly through the different stages deserves to be known as the principal sentiment and this will establish the claims only of the *śṛṅgāra-rasa*. The definition of *karuṇa* insists on the death of the loved person<sup>30</sup> and even though Rāma takes Sītā as dead, actually it is *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra* in his case also and he is made to experience the smoothening touch of Sītā and of course for Sītā the sentiment is *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra*. The development of the sentiment of love is through these stages :-

(1) In the beginning, Sītā is not reconciled about her insult in form of the fire-ordeal; Rāma has failed to convince her about it and there is a great misunderstanding and sorrow on either side. Their minds are not fully clear towards each other.

26. Vide :

*nṛpatīnūm yac caritam nānārasabhāvacēṣṭitam bahudhū |*  
*sukhaduḥkhotpatikṛtam bhavati hi tan nāṭakam nāma ||* 18. 12.

27. Vide: I. 15.

28. *avasthāḥ pañca karyasya prārabdhasya phalārthibhiḥ |*  
*ārambhayatnaprāptyaśāṅkṣā niyatāptiphalāḥ ||*

29. *vibhāvānubhāvavyabhicāribhāvād rasanīṣpattirḥ.*

30. *iṣṭavadhadarśanāt yā vipriyavacanasya saṁśravāt yāpi |*  
*ebhir bhāvaviśeṣaiḥ karuṇaraso nūma sambhavati ||* *Nāṭyaśāstra*, VI. 62.

*iṣṭanāśād anīṣṭāptau śokātma karuṇa 'nu tam |* *Daśarūpaka*, IV. 81.

*iṣṭanāśād anīṣṭāpteiḥ karuṇākhyo raso bhavet |* *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 222.

*mṛtyubandhadhanabhramśaśāpavyasanasambhavaḥ |*  
*karuṇa, bhīnayas tasya bāṣpavaivarnyanindanaiḥ ||* *Nāṭyapdarpaṇa*, III. 14.



(2) This is followed by all efforts on the part of Rāma to reconcile her and her sincere efforts to be reconciled. But both seem to fail.

(3) This is followed by another insult on Sītā in form of her abandonment in deep jungle in her extremely delicate state of advanced pregnancy that aggravates her sorrow and dissatisfaction.

(4) Sītā witnesses the sorrows of Rāma and his deep pangs after six years and that reconciles her fully and now naturally the hero and the heroine have come nearer to each other.

(5) This is followed by Rāma coming into contact with Lava and Kuśa and this is followed by his keen sense of the feeling that Sītā lives and with the universalising of their love, they finally reunite and get the blessings of all.

It is notable that Bhavabhūti has made a change in the original by bringing about the reunion of the hero and the heroine. This is to suit the needs of *nāṭaka* that is expected to have *vira* or *śṛṅgāra* as the principal sentiment as per the definitions laid down by Viśvanātha<sup>31</sup> and Dhanañjaya,<sup>32</sup> and these are the definitions followed by all the dramatists. The hero seeks reunion with the heroine and his efforts are ultimately fruitful.

### Analysis according to Western Principles

Even if we were to apply the western principles of criticism and tragedy, which do not oppose the principal place being given to the *karuṇa* in the drama, the fact remains that the series of sorrowful scenes in the play on one side and the series of sighs and flows of tears and faintings of Rāma and Sītā and others in all glory and beauty, do not develop systematically the *karuṇa* to make it the principal sentiment in the drama. A series of incidents of pathos without any interconnection cannot make the drama a tragedy nor can they give the proud place of becoming the principal sentiment to *karuṇa* in the *Uttararāmacarita*. It is not our intention to undermine the importance and glory of the *karuṇa-rasa* in the play and all the fine pictures of *karuṇa* that the poet creates. The fact still remains that both for Rāma and Sītā as also for the rest of the world, love of the hero and the heroine is the predominant sentiment in the play and from artistic point of view, this is well done. *Karuṇa* has become only a means to an end. In case of Rāma and Sītā it has brought about perfect reconciliation of their minds, hearts and souls, while in case of the subjects, it has made them realise the genuineness of their love and also the purity and

31. Vide: fn. 1 above.

32. Vide: fn. 2 above.

hastity of Sītā. Suffering on the part of Rāma and Sītā has ennobled and sublimated to the highest their love. The specific development of *karuṇa* that we might find in the tragedies of Shakespeare, for example, in *Macbeth*, *Othello* and *Hamlet* will not be found here.

### If it had been a Tragedy

Matters would perhaps have been a little different if the drama had ended in a tragedy. If Sītā had been made to disappear inside the heart of mother earth, as it happens in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, it would have been a just criticism of the fickleness of the people of the world. We might have realised how tragic the attempt to please the people of the world is, sorrowful is the vow of the service to the people. It would have revealed to us the very sad fact that with all their greatness of love, the world was too small and fickle for Sītā to live in. It would have suggested to us the very painful reality that the world measures great and noble minds too on its own very small, poor and fickle scales. It would have made us realised that the love of Rāma and Sītā was too great for the world to own. This tragic picture might have given the coveted place to the *karuṇa* as Bhavabhūti desired it, of course in a flow of excessive sentiment in which his steadfastness as a writer has disappeared and he is carried away with the excessively heavy pathetic situation that he has created. It would also have on the other side added glory to the love of Rāma and Sītā towards each other. It would have rightly made them the very super human towering beings that they actually are. This might have been *karuṇa* the principal sentiment. If this could be possible it would have made a very sad reflection on the fact that the world is too small mentally and emotionally for great minds to live in. And who can deny that this would have been a more natural end to the drama? But that was not possible for Bhavabhūti who had not the courage to improve upon or to go beyond the rules and limitations laid down by Bharata. He had not the courage to depart from rules and conventions; he had not the courage to widen the scope of the rules of drama and to make these more fruitful to the realities of life and enrich them thereby. Sanskrit dramas know of atleast two dramas, the *Uttararāmacarita* and *Mṛcchakaṭika* that are formed in their story in such a way that even a stray reader feels that the more natural end of either is tragedy and not comedy. The comedy in the *Uttararāmacarita* is purely dependent upon the will of the people, who might change even in the future, making thereby the comedy of the drama not a comedy for all time to come; the comedy of the *Mṛcchakaṭika* is dependent upon accident of time and the will of the new king and the end is unnatural. But, one fact stands that even if Bhavabhūti could have made a tragedy of this drama, he would have positively been required to make several

changes in the plot, to make it one that possesses of *karuṇa* as the principal sentiment. It is clear that in the play as it stands at present, if the end had been tragic, it would have projected the *vipralambha-śṛṅgāra* all the more effectively as the principal sentiment, in spite of the fact that with this play as a tragedy, the extremely pathetic situations at several places in the work would have become more effective and clear and fruitful.

### Eko rasaḥ karuṇa eva

Kane,<sup>33</sup> Ghanashyam,<sup>34</sup> Bhatt,<sup>35</sup> Umashankar Joshi<sup>36</sup> and many others have based their arguments regarding the *karuṇa* being the principal sentiment in the drama on Bhavabhūti's own statement:

*eko rasaḥ karuṇa eva vivartabhedāt  
bhinnāḥ pṛthak pṛthag ivāśrayate vivartān /  
āvartabudbudataraṅgamayān vivartān  
ambhaḥ yathā salilam eva hi tatsamasām ||* (III 47)

Raja<sup>37</sup> too follows more or less the same lines. Karmarkar<sup>38</sup> is critical but not very clear on the point. And after we have discussed the whole matter, there still remains one question to be answered. Did Bhavabhūti, who makes this statement, really believe that the *karuṇa* is the principal sentiment in this drama? Did he actually intend to make the *karuṇa* the principal sentiment? As a follower of Sanskrit dramaturgy, he knows his job very well. He knows that if he were to follow the foot-steps of Kālidāsa, and also follow conventions, *karuṇa* could not become the principal sentiment. And if he had the

33 'We may regard him as saying. The underlying sentiment throughout this drama is *karuṇa*. At times it may appear at first sight that the main sentiment is *śṛṅgāra* or *vīra*; but that is only an appearance, the reality is that even there it is *karuṇa* that is the main underlying sentiment'. Notes p. 117.

34. Vide his comments on III 47. *atra karuṇarasa evānyarasaṭvenāpi pariṇatāi iti phalito 'rthaḥ*.

35 Vide his introduction: "If the feeling of pathos were to be related to the universal experience of humanity, it would certainly appear that pathos underlies all experiences". p. 35

36 Vide the section 'Rasanirṇaya' in his introduction to his Gujarati edition.

37. "This deep note of the pathos continues throughout the drama, till in the end everything is resolved", *Survey of Sanskrit Literature*, p 188.

38. "In act III. 47, Bhavabhūti describes the sentiment of pathos as the main or important sentiment dominating all other sentiments which are helpful in heightening the *karuṇa* sentiment. This cannot be said to be true in respect of all poetical compositions. It fits in with the episode in Uttara."

*Bhavabhūti*. p. 64.

courage to set down the new conventions, he intended to establish the *karuṇā* as the principal sentiment. In this case, we will come to the conclusion that the *karuṇā* could not have become the principal sentiment in spite of Bhavabhūti. But, actually we should know the mind of Bhavabhūti the artist before we probe into this problem further. From the literary point of view, Bhavabhūti is a poet whose outlook on life is rather pessimistic and consequently highly idealistic, i.e. he expects too much from men and women of the world. Unlike Kālidāsa whose basic approach is 'Art as an escape into life', Bhavabhūti's approach is 'Art as an escape from life.' On the other side, he is suffering from a great ambition. He wants to become an equal of Kālidāsa. He, therefore, follows Kālidāsa's pattern of *nāṭaka*, makes *śṛṅgāra* the principal sentiment and again, he partly shows his originality by his peculiar selection of the story that will suit his highest idealism and by creating a series of events of pathos in the midst of the deep attachment of love. He has given to us some of the finest statements on love<sup>39</sup> and what part it plays in the life of lovers and men in general. But the most important question to be answered with this probing into the mind of Bhavabhūti is this: Does he really and seriously believe that *karuṇā* is the only *rasa* in literature and, therefore, it is the principal one in this drama? It does not need too much of an argument to prove that even though Bhavabhūti is a very great poet, he is not still a perfectly steady and self-confident artist with very clear views on literary attainment. He normally goes to excesses and therefore sometimes, his situations of *śṛṅgāra* border on vulgarity and some of his descriptions become unpardonably long and tedious. Unfortunately Bhavabhūti is not an artist whom we can call one far above his creation. He is normally prone to be carried away by the emotionalism of the situation created by him.<sup>40</sup> We naturally expect of a great artist that that he remains far above and naturally greater than his creation and that he shall not be carried away by the pathos of the situation that he has created. The creator shall always be greater than

39. Vide verses V. 17; VI. 12; I. 39; VI. 38; II. 19, III. 17; I. 38; I. 34; I. 35; I. 36, etc.

40. This has actually happened at so many places in his *Mālatī-mādhava* and *Uttararāmacarita*. That also explains his bitter attack on his critics in the former play:

*ye nāma kecid iha naḥ prāthayanty avajñāṃ  
jñānti te kim api tān prati naiṣayatnaḥ ;  
utpatyate 'sti mama ko 'pi samānadharmā  
kālo hy aya : niravadhir vipulā ca prthivī . . .* I 3.

creation, then only he will be the Prajāpati of his creation as the famous words of *Agnipurāṇa* state.<sup>41</sup> The present verse coming at the end of the most pathetic scene in the drama, is yet another illustration of the failure of the poet to remain steady, he has, as usual gone to excesses and he has been carried away by the pathos of the situation created by him. We need not, therefore, take this statement very seriously at the movement or establish the view of Bhavabhūti from this a new literary view or take this as an interesting and important literary truth in which he very seriously believed or which he seriously followed.

### Conclusion

Our conclusion on the matter, therefore, is that exactly as per the rules laid down by Viśvanātha and Dhanañjaya, in this play also *śṛṅgāra* of the *vipralambha* type is the principal sentiment and the famous verse of Bhavabhūti on which the other views of scholars are based, is just an outburst of emotionalism that he might have disclaimed in his saner movements.

---

41. *apāre kāvyasaṃsāre kavir ekaḥ prajāpatiḥ |*  
*yathā vai rocate viśvaṃ tathaiva parivartate ||*

## VIṢṆU CULT IN ANCIENT TAMIL LITERATURE \*

### 1. Introduction :

This paper is limited to Caṅkan Literature<sup>1</sup> which, according to tradition, is classified as the *Pattu-p-pāṭṭu* (the Ten Idylls) and the *Eṭṭu-t-tokai* (the Eight Anthologies). *Tirukkuṟal* and *Cilappatikāram* – an epic belonging to a slightly later period<sup>2</sup> also are taken into account in this discussion. The worship of Viṣṇu receives a significant treatment in these works though they were not mainly intended to deal with religious matters. These works contain references not only to the concept of the deity concerned but also to the cult of temple worship and the philosophical and religious settings which formed the background of such worship.<sup>3</sup>

### 2 References to the Deity

2. (1) The Caṅkan classics refer to the worship of Tirumāl (Viṣṇu)<sup>4</sup>, Kṛṣṇa<sup>5</sup>, and Baladeva.<sup>6</sup> The verse in *Puṇānūṟu* collection<sup>7</sup>

---

\* Paper presented to the 25th session of the All-India Oriental Conference held in Calcutta in October, 1969.

1. The majority of classics so far available are assigned to the Pre-Christian periods by Tamil Scholars.
2. Second Century. A few scholars like Prof. S. Vaiyapuri Pillai brings this epic to the age of Pallava supremacy.
3. Subramanya Sastri, P.S. : *Caṅkaṁkalum Vaitṭikamārkkamum* (1951), pp. 46 to 59.
4. *Tirumurukāṇṟup-pāṭṭai* (TMRP), II. 12, 151, 164-65, *Perumpāṇṟup-pāṭṭai* (PRMP), II. 29 to 31, 402 to 404; *Mullai-p-pāṭṭu* (MLP), II. 3 & 4; *Matuṟu-k-kāñci* (MTK) II. 591 & 592. *Kali-t-tokai* (KLT), 105, 119, 124 & 127, *Paripāṭal* (PRP), 1, 2, 3, 4, 13; & 15.
5. *Puṇānūṟu* (PRN), 56, 58, 174, 201 & 378, *Akanānūṟu* (AKN), 59 & 175, KLT 134.
6. *ibid.* 56, KLT. 26, 36, 104 & 105.
7. *ibid.* 56

includes Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva, along with Śiva and Subrahmaṇya, as the four controlling deities of the Universe. This irrefutable evidence that among the gods commanding worship as supreme deities along with the Saivaites pair, is indeed of great significance. The theme 'Pūvainilai', as it is called in *Puṇṇai-Iyal*, aims at the identification of a ruling monarch with one of the principal deities of the Hindu Pantheon, namely Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Śiva.<sup>8</sup> Loyalty to the patron had ever been an admirable trait of the Tamils from time immemorial and there are instances where the king is likened to God. Verily the king is a protector of the people in the same way as Tīrumāl or Māyōn is the protector of the Universe. The *Puṇṇānūru* verse under reference is a fine illustration of the point. Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva are referred to in another place where a Cōla and a Pāṇṇiya are together praised as looking like these gods.<sup>9</sup> One verse in *Akanānūru* refers to the story of Rāma<sup>10</sup> and another verse of the same work *kuravai-k-kūttu* (rāsadance) of Kṛṣṇa<sup>11</sup>. The verse in *Kali-t-tokai* mentions the victory of Kṛṣṇa over the wrestlers and his slaying of them.<sup>12</sup>

2 (2) Apart from these stray references *Paripāṭal* contains six poems in description of Viṣṇu.<sup>13</sup> These are intended to describe the character of Viṣṇu as a deity and have no more definite object of describing the *Bhāgavata* or any other cult as such. Even so the description of Viṣṇu as given in the two poems<sup>14</sup> by one Kaṭuvaṇ Iḷaeyiṇaṇār follows closely rather the description of Viṣṇu as supreme in the Pāñcārātra texts and *Nārāyaṇiya* of the *Mahābhārata* as well. Another poem in the same work by one Iḷamperuvalūtiyār<sup>15</sup> makes a special mention of Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva as the deities installed in Tīrumālirūṇṇōlai. This fact could be confirmed beyond doubt by references in the ancient Tamil Grammar *Tolkāppiyam* where it is stated that the presiding deity at Mullai (pastoral) tract is Māyōn (Tīrumāl) and it is significant that He is mentioned first in the *sūtra*.<sup>16</sup> It has already been pointed out that the king was compared with Tīrumāl. The ethical literary work *Tirukkural* contains two references to this deity.<sup>17</sup>

8. *Tolkāppiyam* (TLK) 3.2:5, ll. 9 & 10.

9. PRN. 58.

10. AKN. 70.

11. *ibid.* 232.

12. KLT 134.

13. PRP. 1, 2, 3, 4, 13 and 15.

14. *ibid.* 2, 3.

15. *ibid.* 15.

16. TLK. 3, 1: 5; cf. *ibid.* 30.

17. *Kural* 610, 1103. In the former the reference to the Lord of the three strides and in the latter the abode of Viṣṇu.

2. (3) In *Cilappadikāram* there are a number of references to the temples of Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva in the Cōḷa capital Kāvīrippūmpaṭṭiṇam and the Pāṇṭiya capital Maturai alike<sup>18</sup>. One of the early shrines in the far south is Tirumālirñcōḷai<sup>19</sup> which finds mention in this epic along with Tiruvaraṅkam<sup>20</sup> and Tirupati<sup>21</sup> as places holy to Viṣṇu. These references establish beyond doubt the prevalence of worship of Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva all over the Tamil land in those periods.

### 3. Concept of the Deity :

3. (1) Many references in these works especially *Paripāṭal* go to form a clear concept of the Deity. The Lord has a divine and auspicious form. The conch and discus are His weapons adorning the left and right hands respectively. The former when blown by Him causes horror to all His foes<sup>22</sup>. He is ever wearing the garland of *tulasi*<sup>23</sup>. He reclines on a couch of Ādiśeṣa<sup>24</sup> and is to be found generally in the milky ocean.<sup>25</sup> Lakṣmī dwells in the chest<sup>26</sup> of Him who is her Husband.<sup>27</sup> The precious stone<sup>28</sup> *Kaustubha* adorns His chest. His garment is golden in colour.<sup>29</sup> These are the marks belonging to Him and serve to distinguish Him from other deities. These also show that He has a divine and auspicious form which could not be described correctly<sup>30</sup> but on that account He is not left undescribed by people, who, on the other hand, describe Him in such expressions as are poor and inadequate and do not have actual relevance to Him.<sup>31</sup> For instance, though Kṛṣṇa, the Lord, is conceived as having two arms, He is in reality having innumerable arms.<sup>32</sup> Here lies His ineffable grandeur. The devotees request Him not to ignore their praise and prayers, but to accept them and bless them not minding their littleness.<sup>33</sup> Garuḍa is His vehicle<sup>34</sup> and His emblem marks His banner.<sup>35</sup>

18. CLP. 1 : 5, ll. 163 to 173; ibid. 2 : 14, ll. 7 to 10.

19. ibid. 2 : 11, l. 91.

20. ibid. 2 : 11, ll. 35 to 40.

21. ibid. 2 : 11, ll. 41 to 51.

22. PRP. 2, ll. 36-40.

23. ibid. 13, l. 60.

24. ibid. 1 ll. 1 & 2.

25. ibid. 13, ll. 26 to 29.

26. ibid. 1, ll. 3 & 9.

27. ibid. 3, l. 90.

28. ibid. 1, ll. 9 & 36.

29. CLP. 2. 11. l. 50; PRP. 1. ll. 10 & 56; ibid. 3, l. 88; ibid. 13. ll. 1 & 2.

30. PRP. 13, ll. 46-49.

31. ibid. 4, ll. 1-5.

32. ibid. 3, ll. 35-45.

33. ibid. 1, ll. 34-36.

34. CLP. 2 : 17, l. 28, PRP. 3 l. 60.

35. PRP. 1, l. 11; ibid. 2, l. 60, ibid. 4. ll. 36-48; ibid. 13, ll. 38-39; PRN. 56, l. 6; ibid. 58, l. 14.



3. (2) The Lord possesses innumerable auspicious qualities. He is the embodiment of *kṛpā*. He is Himself *dharma* (righteousness). He is the sacrificer of those who are incapable of treading the right path. He is the pain of those who are opposed to His ways.<sup>36</sup> His words never fail in their import just as day and night follow each other without fail; His patience is like that of the earth; His grace reaches one and all without any partiality as the cloud impregnated with water.<sup>37</sup>

3. (3) The four *vyūhas* of Pāñcarātra school find references in these works. Vāsudeva is held to be dark in complexion having red eyes, Śaṅkarṣaṇa to be white with black eyes, Pradyumna to be red and Aniruddha green.<sup>38</sup> The popularity of the Pāñcarātra cult during the centuries before the birth of Christ is attested by a reference to the temples of Kṛṣṇa and Baladeva already cited above.

3. (4) Among the divine descents of Viṣṇu those of Kūrma,<sup>39</sup> Varāha, Narasiṃha,<sup>40</sup> Vāmana, Baladeva and Kṛṣṇa are treated. While those of Kūrma, Narasiṃha and Rāma<sup>41</sup> are dealt with in brief references, those of Varāha<sup>42</sup> and Vāmana<sup>43</sup> get special attention; but Kṛṣṇa's descent has a more detailed treatment. Viṣṇu's greatness as the saviour of mankind receives attention in the descents of Varāha and Vāmana. Balarāma is often associated with Kṛṣṇa.

3. (5) One peculiarity that is noticed in these works is that copious references about Kṛṣṇa are found. He is mentioned as the tender child of Yacōtai.<sup>44</sup> His playing on the flute is felt as rapturous and fascinating by the *gopīs*.<sup>45</sup> He is said to play on *vinā* also.<sup>46</sup> Some of his deeds are said to be mysterious and are stated to be incomprehensible. For example, the Lord who could use the serpent Vāsuki as the rope for churning the milky ocean become Himself fit to be bound by Yacōtai with a rope.<sup>47</sup> Viṣṇu was not hungry, but devoured the world. However, he ate butter with avidity as though he was very hungry. He used his feet to measure the entire world, but had to use them in greater frequency when He went to the city of Kauravas as a messenger of the

36. *ibid.* 1. *ll.* 37-40

37. *ibid.* 4. *ll.* 25-27.

38. *ibid.* 3. *ll.* 81-82.

39. CLP. 2 : 12, *l.* 58.

40. PRP. 4, *ll.* 11-21.

41. AKN. 70; PRN. 378. MNM. 17, *ll.* 9-14; *ibid.* 5, *l.* 37.

42. PRP. 2, *l.* 16; 3, *l.* 24; 13, *l.* 36.

43. CLP. 2 : 17, *ll.* 34, 35; 1 : 6, *l.* 55.

44. CLP. 2 : 16, *ll.* 45-46.

45. *ibid.* 2 : 7, *l.* 2; *ibid.* 27, *ll.* 18-19.

46. PRP. 3, *l.* 86.

47. CLP. 2 : 17, *l.* 32,

Pāṇḍavas.<sup>48</sup> These show that He being *māyōn*<sup>49</sup> or *māyavan*<sup>50</sup> could introduce mysterious activities in His own deeds. There are also references to the incidents like 'taking away the garments of the *gopis*.<sup>51</sup> driving the chariot of Arjuna,<sup>52</sup> killing the demon Vatca<sup>53</sup> and hiding the sun with discus<sup>54</sup>.

3. (6). Kṛṣṇa married Nīlā, the daughter of Kumbha, the brother of Yacōtai.<sup>55</sup> Tamil literature has introduced a new person Nappinnai by name<sup>56</sup> and made her play a prominent role in the life of Kṛṣṇa. She takes the place of Nīlā in these classics. Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma had many exploits in the Gokula during which they stood on each side of Nappinnai and danced. They changed their positions and danced again. Nārada is said to have written the work *Nārada-śikṣā* treating the *tāḷa* according to which they danced.<sup>57</sup> When Kṛṣṇa was sporting in the waters of Yamunā with the *gopis*, He took out the bracelet from one of them and made them all feel unhappy<sup>58</sup>. Kṛṣṇa is stated to have danced whenever there was some activity in which He was engaged. For instance when He broke the tusk of the elephant Kuvalayāpīḍa, He danced. And this dance is called *alliyam*.<sup>59</sup> He played *kuṭa-k-kūttu* dance when He went to fight with Bāṇa.<sup>60</sup>

3. (7). Balarāma is considered to be one of the *avatāras* of Viṣṇu and He is quite often treated as having the same status as that of Kṛṣṇa<sup>61</sup>. He is described to have had the emblem of the elephant in his banner and a single ear-ornament.<sup>62</sup> The paradox in the case of Kṛṣṇa and Balarāma is that Kṛṣṇa is held to be the younger brother of Balarāma. But he is very ancient and much older. Really He is between the ancient and the modern. The only way knowing Him is through the *Vedas*.<sup>63</sup> The paradox that arises here proves only that

48. *ibid.* 2: 17, ll. 32-34.

49. PRP. 15, l. 33.

50. CLP. 2: 17, l. 14-15, 27-28.

51. *ibid.* 2: 17, l. 23.

52. *ibid.* 2: 17, l. 34.

53. *ibid.* 2: 17, l. 19.

54. *ibid.* 2: 17, l. 26.

55. Cf. *Garuḍaparāṇa - Uttarakāṇḍa*, ch. 19.

56. CLP. 2: 17, ll. 14-16, 24.

57. *ibid.* 2: 17, ll. 25-26.

58. *ibid.* 2: 17, ll. 23-24.

59. *ibid.* 1: 6, ll. 46-48.

60. *ibid.* 1: 6, ll. 54-55.

61. PRP. 1, ll. 3-5.

62. *ibid.* 1, l. 5.

63. *ibid.* 2, ll. 20-27.

He is the essence of everything<sup>64</sup> and so He could present Himself anywhere, at any time and in any form He chooses.

3.(8). Among the *arcā* forms the deities at Tirumalai, Tiruvarāṅkam, Tirumāliuṇcōlai and Tiruvanantapuram are referred to. Tiruvarāṅkam (Śrī Raṅgam) is the holy place on the island created by the branching of the river Kāviri. The deity there is reclining on the serpent couch.<sup>64</sup> Tirumalai which marks the northern limit of the Tamil country is the hill of Viṣṇu<sup>65</sup> abounding in many streams. The deity in the temple on the hills is Viṣṇu the ornaments on whose person are referred to as dazzling in appearance. The sun and the moon are described as the discus and conch of the Lord. The Lord appears like a blue cloud with the sun and moon shining on each side, lightning playing the part of a new garment. He is in the standing posture.<sup>67</sup> Viṣṇu lies on the serpent couch at Tiruvanantapuram<sup>68</sup> which is also known as Āṭakamā-tam. The Lord takes His abode anywhere. He chooses His abode beneath the banyan or *kaṭampa* tree or in the island formed between the two branches of a river. He may choose the hill or the form of any other deity. He is present everywhere to carry out the wishes of His devotees and keep them in the path of their duties.<sup>69</sup> *Paripāṭal* mentions a temple for Viṣṇu very near to Maturai.<sup>70</sup> The place which is also known as Kuḷavāy has also a temple for Ādiśeṣa.<sup>71</sup> The place is also known as Iruntaiyūr<sup>72</sup> which is identified by Prof. M. Raghava Ayyengar to be the temple of Kūṭalalakar in Maturai<sup>73</sup>

3. (9). The concept of *antaryāmin* has found a place in these works. The Lord is present in the hearts of His devotees. He is ever-cherished by them.<sup>74</sup> Yet, the devotees do not correctly know Him although He is exquisitely described in the *Upaniṣads* as having the highest qualities and accomplishments.<sup>75</sup>

#### 4. Supremacy of the Deity :

4.(1). The Lord is supreme, in every way and has no equals. There

64. *ibid.* 2, l. 20. Vide Parimēlalakar's commentary on this line.

65. CLP. 1: 10, l. 156, 2: 11, ll. 35 - 40.

66. *ibid.* 1: 6, l. 30 1: 8, l. 1, 2; 2: 11, l. 41.

67. *ibid.* 2: 11, ll. 41 - 52.

68. *ibid.* 2: 26, l. 62; 30, l. 51

69. PRP. 4, ll. 66 - 73.

70. *Paripāṭal Tirattū*, 1, ll. 1 - 6.

71. *ibid.* 1, ll. 60 - 64.

72. *ibid.* 1, l. 5.

73. *Āṛāycci-t-tokai*, pp. 241 - 244.

74. PRP. 3, l. 84.

75. *ibid.* 4, ll. 57 - 65,

are many references in these works to this aspect of the Lord. Viṣṇu is mentioned as the foremost among gods.<sup>76</sup> He is often referred to as the pre-eminent deity spoken of in the *Vedas*<sup>77</sup> which reveal His greatness,<sup>78</sup> and make Him known. He is beyond the faculties of apprehension even for sages whose intellect is perfected by constant meditation.<sup>79</sup> He is not only greater than the gods but also the demons. He is neither the friend nor the foe of any one. His impartial attitude is thus revealed towards all living beings.<sup>80</sup>

4 (2) The Lord is the moon and the sun; He is Śiva, the god of destruction; He is Brahmā, the god of creation; in fact, He is Himself the very destruction and creation. He is Himself the cloud, *ākāśa*, earth and the Himālayas.<sup>81</sup> It is because that He is everything that He becomes indescribable. There is nothing outside Him which could be brought in for purposes of drawing comparison or contrast with Him. Naturally He is equal to Himself<sup>82</sup>

4. (3) The five elements, the sun, the moon and the sacrificer, the five planets other than the sun and the moon, the demons, the twelve Ādityas, the eight Vasus, the eleven Rudras, the Aśvins, Yama and his servants, and the twenty one worlds together with the beings inhabiting them arise from Viṣṇu and grow in Him. This is the truth revealed from the *Vedas*.<sup>83</sup> All these represent him. Symbolically, the vast earth represents His feet, the sea His garment, the sky His body, the directions His arms and the sun and the moon His eyes.<sup>84</sup> The depiction of the sky as His body receives support from the *Taittiriya Upaniṣad*.<sup>85</sup> This must be the reason for taking the Lord to be blue in colour.<sup>86</sup> In a way, this description of the Lord may be treated as lending support to the relation of self and body (*śarīra-śarīri-bhāva*) as existing between Viṣṇu and the world of sentient and non-sentient beings. In fact, He forms the inner essence of everything.<sup>87</sup>

76. *ibid.* 13, *ll.* 1 – 13.

77. *ibid.* 1, *l.* 13; 2, *l.* 58, *ll.* 12 – 27.

78. *ibid.* 1, *l.* 65

79. *ibid.* 3, *ll.* 46 – 52; 4, *ll.* 1 – 3; PRN. 56, *l.* 6; 58, *l.* 14.

80. *ibid.* 3, *ll.* 54 – 58.

81. *ibid.* 1, *ll.* 41–48.

82. *ibid.* 1, *ll.* 50–53.

83. *ibid.* 3, *ll.* 4–14.

84. NRR. invocatory verse.

85. *Taitt. Up.* 1. 6 : 14.

86. PRP. 1, *ll.* 6–7.

87. *ibid.* 3, *ll.* 63–68.

4. (4) All the worlds lose their stability and energy day by day and after aeons, become reduced to a stage when their existence could not be made out. The sun and the moon also become extinct by then.<sup>88</sup> Many aeons pass by. After a long time, matter emerges and from it are produced, in the order, *ākāśa*, air, fire, and water, the succeeding one emerging from the antecedent. Aeons roll by and after a long period from the water, earth is evolved. The water is then so swaggering that the earth is on the point of getting fully submerged there. Viṣṇu takes the form of a boar then and keeps the earth secure. This is one of the countless sports of Viṣṇu. Viṣṇu is said to have married the earth known as Bhūdevī. It is humorously remarked here by the poet that this marriage cannot be happy since his first consort Lakṣmī is ever present on His chest.<sup>89</sup>

4. (5) He is the father of Brahmā,<sup>90</sup> whom he had created for looking after the subsequent creation. As He is the substance itself and its inner core, He is not living in it nor is there a place beside Him for others to live in.<sup>91</sup> He is the only Lord who safeguards the twenty-one worlds in three parts under the umbrella of His grace, *dharma* being its handle.<sup>92</sup> The twenty-five realities (*tattvas*) serve the purpose of realizing Him through them.<sup>93</sup> He is the protector of all. The discus adorns His right hand<sup>94</sup> in order that He could use it against those who violate His law. He measured the entire region to wrest it from the demon and saved it from deluge taking the form of a boar.<sup>95</sup> He took the form of a swan and saved the earth, with its outstretched wings from the torrential rain of deluge<sup>96</sup>. His ability to vanquish the foes and His brilliance are found in the sun. Various objects of nature reflect many of His attributes: His sympathy and splendour in the moon, His tenderness and the liberality in the cloud, His power of sustenance and patience in the earth, His fragrance and effulgence in flowers, His exterior appearance and vastness in the sea, His form and voice in the *ākāśa* and His divine descent and disappearance in the air. All these owe their origin to Him, and exist, as it were, away from Him, but really sustained by Him.<sup>97</sup>

---

88. *ibid.* 2, // 1-4.

89. *ibid.* 2, // 28-35.

90. *ibid.* 3, // 13-14.

91. *ibid.* 3, // 69-70.

92. *ibid.* 3, // 73-76.

93. *ibid.* 3, // 77-80.

94. *ibid.* 1, // 52-53.

95. *ibid.* 3, // 19-25.

96. *ibid.* 3, // 25 & 26.

97. *ibid.* 4, // 25-35.

5. *Worship of the Deity :*

5. (1) The worship of Viṣṇu is frequently recommended in these works.<sup>98</sup> Final release from worldly bondage could not be got except by worshipping the Lord.<sup>99</sup> Devotion to the Lord is to be preferred even to the correct knowledge that one can get about Viṣṇu and His nature.<sup>100</sup> Worship shall be done only at His feet.<sup>101</sup> One shall wish for the enduring security which the feet of the Lord give.<sup>102</sup> The head of the devotee shall be bent before and near His feet. A devotee shall do this with his relatives also.<sup>103</sup> No one shall refrain from worshipping Viṣṇu's feet which are the source of everything and which are capable of cutting the chain of birth and rebirth.<sup>104</sup>

5. (2). The devotees of God shall seek Him for refuge. They could offer their worship to God even from a distance if they are unable to reach the place where He dwells.<sup>105</sup> They shall, if it is practicable, live as near the temple as possible.<sup>106</sup> They shall offer their prayers to Him by addressing Him as Keśava<sup>107</sup> and Nārāyaṇa.<sup>108</sup> Even the gods praise Him as the ancient people did.<sup>109</sup> A devotee shall be free from self-conceit because of which Garuḍa was taught a lesson by the Lord.<sup>110</sup> The ardent devotee feels that he has become fortunate to share the love of God along with others mainly owing to the good deeds done by him in the previous births.<sup>111</sup> The ideal yearning of a devotee of Viṣṇu is brought to light by describing that the devotee would not feel happy unless he gets the vision of the Lord to serve Him. The ears shall be taken to have served the purpose of their existence by listening to the reputed exploits of Viṣṇu who measured the entire universe in two steps and who went to the forest as Rāma along with His younger brother Lakṣmaṇa. The eyes fail to be lucky if they do not behold Him, His hands, feet and mouth. The eyes should keep cast on Him without even a wink. The only act for the tongue shall be to praise Him who went to the Kauravas to run an errand to the Pāṇḍavas.

98. *ibid.* 2, ll. 5-19.

99. *ibid.* 2, ll. 15-17.

100. *ibid.* 1, ll. 33, 34.

101. *ibid.* 1, ll. 62-65.

102. *ibid.* 1, ll. 63-65.

103. *ibid.* 2, ll. 66-77.

104. *ibid.* 3, ll. 1-2, 15-16.

105. *ibid.* 15, l. 35.

106. *ibid.* 15, ll. 64-66.

107. *ibid.* 3, l. 31.

108. CLP. 2: 17, l. 37.

109. PRP. 3; ll. 28-30.

110. *ibid.* 3, ll. 59-62.

111. *ibid.* 13, ll. 61-64.

Viṣṇu is here identified with Vāmana, Rāma and Kṛṣṇa in these contexts.<sup>112</sup>

#### 6. *Some original anecdotes :*

The Tamil classics contain many anecdotes and descriptions of the stories of the *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata* and *Bhāgavata* which could not be traced to the Sanskrit sources. Three of them which relate to the life of Kṛṣṇa deserve mention here; they are the introduction of Nappinnai<sup>113</sup> – the consort of Kṛṣṇa in Gokulam, Kṛṣṇa's breaking down of the *Kurunta* tree while taking away the robes of the *gopā* maidens who were taking their bath in the Yamuna,<sup>114</sup> and His *kuṭa-k-kūttu*.<sup>115</sup>

#### 7. *Conclusion :*

It may, therefore, be concluded that the cult of Viṣṇu as found treated and referred to in ancient Tamil literature could have come into being in the Tamil country as a result, perhaps of the influence of the religious doctrines which are recorded in Sanskrit works. Yet, the development and treatment of this faith of the hoary past have been indigenous and exerted profound influence on the unique growth of the cult which is marked by the erection of the temples most of which are found only in the regions where the Tamil language is spoken. It is further noted that the tenets of this faith do not get a systematic treatment and exposition in these source books but they have left an indelible impression on the Tamil Vaishnavite saints known as the Āḷvārs who attached greater importance to the path of devotion than to the other paths. It is not, therefore, a surprise if the principles of the cult of Viṣṇu as are treated in these classics gave an impetus to the rise of religious poetry at the hands of the Āḷvārs.

[12. CLP. 2. 17 35, 36, 37.

[13. CLP. 2. 17. 16, 28

[14. *ibid.* 2. 17: 21; AKN 59 and old commentary.

[15. *ibid.* 1. 6, ll. 54 – 55; V de : Subbu Reddiar, N : *Religion and Philosophy of Nūḷā-yira Divya Prabhandham with special reference to Nammāḷvār*-Appendix III.

## A NOTE ON THE KĀCA PROBLEM OF GUPTA HISTORY

Kāca problem is one of the interesting and still undecided problems of Gupta history. Historians have worked hard over this problem and various kinds of theories are forwarded. Some of those theories are :

1) Kāca was a powerful man who seized the throne having expelled Candragupta I and issued those coins.

2) Kāca was a rebel who usurped the Gupta throne during Samudragupta's absence while the latter went to conquer southern India.

3) Kāca was Ghaṭotkaca.

4) Kāca was Samudragupta himself.

5) Kāca was a brother or relation of Samudragupta and that the Kāca coins are actually medals struck in the memory of that relation or brother by Samudragupta.

6) Kāca was Rāmagupta.

7) Kāca coins were issued by Samudragupta in the memory of his grandfather Ghaṭotkaca.

8) Kāca was a king belonging to a royal dynasty of Southern India.

Out of the above noted eight theories the first three theories can be rejected if we accept the expert opinion of the numismatists that the Kāca coins belong to a period later than the period in which the *Aśvamedha* and the tiger-slaying coins of Samudragupta were issued.<sup>1</sup> The first two theories noted above, are also rejectable on the ground that a powerful rebel asserting power and assuming royal status would

---

1. A.S. Altekar: *Guptakālin Mudrayen*, p. 57.



have added some epithet to his name signifying his independent royal position. But in Kāca coins not even *śrī* is added to the name. The sixth theory is rejected on the ground that available Rāmagupta coins are all copper coins while Kāca coins are gold coins. Secondly it is to be remembered that historical identification of Rāmagupta has not yet been finally made. Thirdly as Dr. Altekar has pointed out, the name Kāca cannot be found in any of the Rāmagupta coins which are all made of copper bearing the name Rāmagupta. Why should one and the same person issue gold coins in the name of Kāca and copper coins in the name of Rāmagupta? As regards the eighth theory, Dr. Buddha-prakash has not thrown sufficient light on the problem, so that we could accept the historical value of the hypothesis that one south Indian king named Kāca, about whom we learn from a cave inscription at Ajanta issued gold coins which bear marked similarity with Gupta coins and which bears the legend ending with *divaṃ jayati* which too was a practice with the Gupta rulers as we find several Gupta kings having the same *divaṃ jayati* legend on their coins. So the probability is that those were issued by a Gupta monarch and that they should be placed in a period later than the period when Samudragupta issued his *aśvamedha* and tiger-slaying and also his archer type of coins. Under the circumstances we are led to the conclusion that those were issued by Samudragupta and that either Samudragupta's another name was Kāca or those were commemorative medals struck by Samudragupta for some brother or relation who had lost his life in the war of liberation, or Samudragupta issued them in commemoration of his grandfather Ghaṭotkaca. Though there is nothing unusual on the part of a grandson issuing commemorative medals for a grandfather, the difficulty in accepting this theory lies in the fact that Ghaṭotkaca is nowhere glorified as a great or worthy forefather by his successors. In Gupta records he is referred to simply as a *Mahārāja*. There is no marked respect showed to him in the records of his successors nor he is considered to be the real founder of the dynasty, the credit for which goes to Candragupta I. It is difficult for us to identify Samudragupta with Kāca, because in none of the Gupta records not even in *Allahabad-prasasti*, which gives us details about the selection of Samudragupta for the throne, and thus indirectly throws light on his position as a prince, there is any reference to him as a prince named Kāca. So the only possibility which remains is that Kāca coins were issued by Samudragupta in the memory of a dear one. We cannot say nor is there any information if Chandragupta I had to carry on any serious war-fare against the Kusan rulers of India. If such was the situation not only a prince named Kāca (if we accept him as another son of Candragupta I) but Samudragupta also might have taken an active and useful part. But the *Allahabad-prasasti* simply

tells us that he was a worthy son of his father and so the latter nominated him for the throne. We are not told that he helped his father by his prowess in a war against foreign rulers, the Sakas or Yavanas or Mlecchas and that victory in such a war helped his cause in getting the throne from his father. In fact Chandra Gupta I carved out a kingdom for himself during the days of political turmoil and confusion following the downfall of the Kusans. It seems the Kusans were not driven out of India but they had to go, the reasons for which do not include any war made against them by north-eastern local rulers including Chandra Gupta I. So the hypothesis that Kāca was a Gupta prince, probably a brother of Samudragupta who had lost his life in a Kusan war has little political or historical standing. Then who can be this prince Kāca in whose memory Samudragupta might have issued those coins. The *Allahabad-praśasti* suggests the existence of a rival claimant for the throne for Samudragupta. A rival for the throne could be a brother and we are told that the rival and his adherents all looked sad and dejected when Samudragupta was selected by Chandra Gupta I for the throne. It seems the rival, whoever he might have been, had equal or perhaps greater claim for the throne. We do not know if there was a civil war between that prince and Samudragupta. But hints at such a war, is suggested in the *Allahabad-praśasti* which seems to emphasize on the fact that the hero of the bloody exploits, whose glory was sung in the said *praśasti*, though not the rightful heir, had the strength of nomination by the father, in his favour.

It is noteworthy that even by that time when Samudragupta had firmly established his reputation as a conqueror and had returned from his victorious campaigns in the southern, central and northern India, doubts about his legal claim for the throne lingered in the memory of the people and so his court poet Harisena points out in the very beginning of the *Allahabad-praśasti* that the strength of his position lay in the fact that he was nominated by his father. So is it improbable that Samudragupta, a diplomat as he was, befriended his aggrieved brother who had probably equal or stronger claim for the throne and issued coins on his name?

It has been pointed out by a scholar<sup>2</sup> that the Guptas had a practice of naming a grandson after the grandfather. So it is possible that Kāca who was probably the eldest son of Candragupta I, was named Kaca after Ghaṭotkaca Gupta and it is worth-noting in this connection that in the Kāca coins, the name is somewhere Kāca and somewhere Kaca which can be an abbreviation of Ghaṭotkaca. So Samudragupta, either

2. *Kāca Problem - A Re-examination* - by Sibesh Bhattacharya; *Journal of Indian History*, vol. XLV, pt. III, December 1967, Serial No. 135.

in memory of the rival brother Kāca, who had died by the time when the coins were issued or was still living, issued those coins which helped in winning the favour of not only that prince and his family but also those people at court and in the empire who still had sympathy for that prince. Besides being a diplomat, Samudragupta was soft-hearted' (*mṛdu-hṛdaya*) according to the *Allahabad-praśasti*. So it is possible that in the corner of his heart Samudragupta had some love and compassion for the brother and he, when firmly established on the throne, issued those medals to please that prince Kāca and his followers and supporters. Diplomacy and love for power can go with human sentiments, and human conscience sometimes gets predominance particularly in the case of those persons who are made of superior elements, and who by their exceptional abilities have already achieved their desired ends.

The fact that both *Cakradhvaja* and *Garuḍadhvaja* are noted in Kāca coins is also significant. *Garuḍadhvaja* was the banner of Samudragupta. It seems *Cakradhvaja* was a banner of Kāca, which he carried in his war against Samudragupta. Probably the appearance of both the types of banners on Kāca coins points to the final agreement reached between the two brothers. Samudragupta, it is possible, on this occasion issued Kāca coins on which the banners of both are noticed.

We cannot also ignore the fact that according to the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa*, Samudragupta had a younger brother named Bhasma who fought for the throne with Samudragupta. It is quite possible that Bhasma was another name of Kāca. The final submission of the rival party to Samudragupta is also hinted at in the *Allahabad-praśasti*. The claim of a younger son, however, cannot be strong at all. The possibility is that Bhasma alias Kāca was the son of another queen of Candragupta I and that he was a half brother of Samudragupta with little or no difference in age.

So we can finally say on this knotty problem of Gupta history that Kāca was a Gupta prince, a half brother of Samudragupta. His another name was Bhasma. He, by his birth, had a strong claim for the throne. Probably both at the court and in the kingdom, there were people who had strong sympathy for him. There was a war between Kāca and Samudragupta for the throne. Samudragupta was victorious. On his return from his campaigns in different quarters, Samudragupta first performed the *Aśvamedha* sacrifice and then issued the Kāca coins which bear both his banner and the banner of Kāca. And thus Samudragupta proved before the public the final settlement of his differences.

with his brother Kāca. The submission of Kāca, the position of Samudragupta as the emperor finally established, and the end of all differences in the royal house for the throne, and the union between the two brothers, are all reflected in the Kāca coins, the author of which was Samudragupta himself as the term *sarvarājocchetā* on the coins signify. The data collected and critically studied from the *Allahabad-prasasti*, *Mañjuśrī-mūlakalpa* and the Gupta coins can possibly lead to such interpretation of facts as given above.



## सीतारावणसंवादझरी

संस्कृतभाषायां वर्णचित्रात्मकानि बहूनि काव्यानि वाग्देवीप्रसादलब्धप्रतिष्ठैः  
प्रतिभाशालिभिः कविभिर्निर्मितान्युपलभ्यन्ते । यमकमनुप्रासश्चेति द्वाविमौ शब्दा-  
लङ्कारौ संस्कृतकाव्यशास्त्रे सुप्रसिद्धौ श्रूयेते । पञ्चगन्धादयो विविधाश्चित्रविशेषा अपि  
एतयोरेव रूपभेदेष्वन्तर्भवन्तीति शास्त्रविदःसमामनन्ति ।

एते च शब्दालङ्काराः किमपि अर्थस्वारस्यं न पुष्पन्ति, केवले शब्दचमत्कारे  
विश्राम्यन्तीति हेतोरेतेषां निबन्धे कालिदासादयो महाकवयो विशेषेण आदरं न  
दर्शयामासुः । अयत्नोपनतानेव कांश्चिदनुप्रासान् स्वकाव्ये तत्र तत्र निवेशयामासुः ।  
यथा रघुवंशे —

(१) 'दोहावसाने पुनरेव दोग्ध्रीं  
भेजे भुजोच्छिन्नरिपुर्निषण्णाम् ।' (II. 23 )

(२) 'सप्त व्यतीयुस्त्रिगुणानि तस्य  
दिनानि दीनोद्धरणोचितस्य ।' (II 25 )

(३) 'ततो मृगेन्द्रस्य मृगेन्द्रगामी  
वधाय वध्यस्य शरं शरण्यः ।  
जाताभिषङ्गो नृपतिर्निषङ्गा-  
दुद्धर्तुमैच्छत्प्रसभोद्धृतारिः ॥' (II. 30.)

इत्यादौ कालिदासः शब्दालङ्कारमनायासेनैव निबन्ध । परं तु तत्र विशेषेण आस्थाया  
अभावात् कालिदासः स्वकाव्येषु बाहुल्येन शब्दालङ्कारान्न नियोजयामास ।

अत्रेदं विचारणीयम् । किं शब्दालङ्काराः काव्यमर्मज्ञैः सर्वथैव उपेक्षणीया  
भवन्ति ? यदि ते कामपि शोभां न संपादयन्ति, तर्हि तेषामलङ्कारत्वमेव व्याह्रियेत ।  
तस्मात्काव्येषु कचित् कचित् शब्दालङ्काराणामुपनिबन्धो वाञ्छनीय एवेति संप्रति-  
पद्यामहे । एतावत्तु स्वीकुर्मो यदमी शब्दालङ्काराः पुनः पुनरुपनिबध्यमाना  
अर्थसौष्ठवाभावे पाठकानामुद्वेगं जनयन्ति न चमत्कारम् । अल्पशक्तयः कवयो हि  
यथाकथंचित् शब्दयोजनामालेण कृतार्थतामभिमन्यमानाः, चमत्कारिणोऽर्थस्य विरहाद्वैर-  
स्यापादकं किमपि निबध्नीयुः । तादृशशब्दालङ्काराणां प्रयोगो न वाञ्छनीय इति  
तात्पर्येणैव शास्त्रकाराः शब्दचित्राणामर्थचित्तेभ्यो निकृष्टतामाहुः । एकाक्षरद्वयक्षरादीनि  
हि चित्राणि क्लिष्टव्युत्पत्तिलब्धैरप्रतीतार्थैः व्याख्यामात्रगम्यैः शब्दैर्निष्पन्नस्वरूपाणि  
पौनःपुन्येन प्रयुज्यमानानि सहृदयानामानन्दं न विदधतीत्यनुभवसाक्षिकोऽयमर्थः ।

शब्दचमत्कारप्रधानेष्वलङ्कारेषु केचिद् भेदाः सहृदयहृदयावर्जकमर्थसौन्दर्यमपि  
पुष्पन्तः कवेरसाधारणं शब्दार्थयोजनानैपुण्यमादिष्कुर्वन्ति । ते च भूयांसोऽपि  
रसिकानामुद्वेगं न जनयन्ति, प्रत्युत महान्तमानन्दमेव संपादयन्ति । ‘सीतारावण-  
संवादझरी’ प्रमुखाः प्रबन्धा अस्यां कोटौ निविशन्ते । अत्र शब्दचमत्कारेण  
सहार्थचमत्कारस्यापि पुष्कलतयोपलम्भात् ईदृशाः प्रबन्धाः सर्वादरणीयतां भजन्ते ।  
प्रदर्शयिष्यमाणेषु पद्येषु सहृदयाः पाठकाः स्वयमेवार्थचमत्कारमपि अविकलं द्रक्ष्यन्तीति  
विश्वसिमः ।

अस्य ग्रन्थस्य ‘सीतारावणसंवादझरी’ इति नानैव प्रतिपाद्यो विषयः  
स्पष्टो भवति । अशोकवने बन्दीकृतां सीतां प्रलोभयितुं रावणः प्रयस्यति ।  
तस्याः पतिव्रताया मनसि मोहमापादयितुं स स्वयमात्मनो गुणानतिवेलं  
प्रशंसति ; रामं च विविधान् दोषानुत्प्रेष्य निन्दति । रामायणे सुन्दरकाण्डेऽयं  
प्रसङ्गः विस्तरेण वर्णितो दृश्यते । पतिपरायणा सीता तु रावणस्य दुष्प्रलापं श्रुत्वा न  
व्यामुह्यति ; स्वधर्मं न विमुञ्चति ; तृणमन्तरतः कृत्वा तं धूर्तं प्रतिभाषते ; रामे  
तेनारोपितान् दोषान्विराकरोति ; तस्य रक्षप्तः पापानि घोषयति ; रामलक्ष्मणौ  
दूरमपवाह्य परदारचौर्यं कृतवतस्तस्य कापुरुषत्वं साधयति ; तस्य दोषान् दर्शयित्वा,

त्वामहं पदापि न स्मृशेयम्' इति दृढं संकल्पमावेदयति । सीतया तिरस्कृतो रावणः किमपि प्रत्युत्तरं वक्तुमशक्तः सपत्नीकस्ततोऽपसरति । 'एवं सीता पातिव्रत्यस्य प्रभावेण निर्भीका यद्रावणं प्रत्यवादीत्, तत्सर्वं शिशुपावृक्षस्थो हनुमान् सादरं शुश्राव । स चैतं वृत्तान्तं यथायथं रामाय निवेदयामास इति' रामायणे श्रूयते । तदिदमुपजीव्य प्रवृत्तोऽयं सीतारावणसंवादझरीसमाख्यो ग्रन्थः ।

अस्य ग्रन्थस्य लेखकः चामराजनगरनिवासी रामशस्त्री नाम कविदयः प्रस्तावनायामस्य ग्रन्थस्य उत्पत्तिमधिकृत्य एवमाह — “अयं खलु ग्रन्थोऽस्यां महीशूरराजधान्यां गते सति पञ्चषष्ठ्यधिकाष्टशत्युत्तरे क्रिस्तशकाब्दानां सहस्रे समुपनतस्य प्रभवसंवत्सरस्य वैशाखशुक्लसप्तम्यां सहृदयहृदयाह्लादिनीमर्थेषुष्टिमजहतः कस्यचिदतिदुर्घटस्य निगूढमर्थ-चनत्कारं विभ्रतो वर्णचित्रकाव्यस्य निर्माणतः सर्वत्र भूतलेऽतिमहत् स्वसाहसं प्रदर्शयितुमभिलष्य, तथाविधपद्यरचनायां प्रारीप्सितायामुक्तिप्रत्युक्तघोरेव गूढार्थदर्णगर्भीकरण-सौकर्यप्रतिभाते सति, तादृगुक्तिप्रयुक्तघोरन्विष्टयेर्भगवता वाल्मीकिना श्रीमद्रामायणे प्रतिपादितस्य सर्वजनादरणीयस्य सीतारावणसंवादस्यैव तादृशतायां प्रतिभातायां तस्यैवात्र विषयतया समाश्रयणात् प्रतिपाद्यार्थस्य स्फुटनिवेदनाय सीतारावणसंवादझरीत्येव नाम्ना ग्रन्थितुमारभ्यत । तदा प्रभृति त्रिशदब्दपर्यन्तमम्लानमेव महान्तमुत्साहमाश्रित्य प्रतिक्षणमतिमहतावधानेनान्वेषणतः कथं कथमपि संगृहीतानि व्युत्पत्तिविशेषोत्थापितार्थैः संकेताक्षरैर्गर्भीकृतेन, पतिव्रतोक्तिभङ्गोमङ्गलकुर्वतैव सीतायाः प्रतिवचनेन, स्वस्तुतिपराणां निन्दापरत्वं, रामनिन्दापराणां च स्तुतिपरत्वं रावणोक्तीनां यथा स्यात्तथाऽर्थप्रतिपादकानि पदानि संगमय्य, विद्वत्कविजनाभिनन्दनीयेन बुद्धिदिलसितेन एकैकशो निष्पादितैः स्वाभिमतैर्गूढार्थप्रत्युत्तरैः पञ्चाशत्पद्यैः सीताप्रतिवचनौचित्यभङ्गन्याप्यङ्गीकारेण परप्रत्यायनार्थमनिच्छयैः संवटितैः प्राचीनपद्यविधैर्नवभिः स्फुटार्थप्रत्युत्तरपद्यैः श्रीरामकथा-संगहार्थमुपरचितैः पूर्वोत्तरपीठिकापद्यैश्च समग्रः षण्णवत्यधिकाष्टशत्युत्तरैकसहस्रतमे क्रिस्तशकाब्दे दुर्मुखिनाम्नास्मदीयैर्व्यवहियमाणे निरवर्त्यत” इति । एतेनास्य ग्रन्थस्य निर्माणं 1865 तमे क्रिस्ताब्दे उपक्रान्तमिति, 896 तमे च क्रिस्ताब्देऽयं ग्रन्थः पूर्तिमगादिति स्पष्टमावेदितम् ।

“भविव्री रम्भोरु त्रिदशऋदनःलानिरधुना

स मे रामः स्थाता न युधि पुरतो लक्ष्मणसखः ।



इयं यास्यत्युच्चैर्विपदमधुना वानरचमूः

लविण्ठेदं षष्ठाक्षरपरविलोपात्पठ पुनः ॥”

इत्येतत्पाचीनं पद्यं सुप्रसिद्धमुपलभ्यते । अत्र त्रिषु पादेषु रावणस्योक्तिर्निबद्धा । “अधुना राणारम्भे रामस्य पराजयं दृष्ट्वा त्रिदशानां देवानां वदनग्लानिर्भविष्यति । लक्ष्मणसहितो रामः संग्रामे मम पुरः स्थातुं न शक्यति । एषा च वानरसेना महतीं विपत्तिं यास्यति ” इति रावणः स्ववोर्यं श्लाघते । सीता तु तस्येदं विकथनमसह-  
नाना प्रतिवक्ति — ‘सप्तमाक्षरं लोपयित्वा पुनरपि तदेव पठ’ इति । प्रतिपादं सप्तमाक्षरस्य लोपे कृते अस्य पद्यस्य रूपान्तरमेवं परिणमति —

“भवित्री रम्भोरु दशवदनग्लानिरधुना

स मे रामः स्थाता युधि पुरतो लक्ष्मणसखः ।

इयं यास्यत्युच्चैः पदमधुना वानरचमूः ”

इति । अस्या रूपान्तरपरिणताया रावणोक्तेरयमर्थो निष्पद्यते यद् ‘अधुना राणारम्भे रावणस्य ग्लानिर्भविष्यति । रामश्च सलक्ष्मणो मम पुरो जितकाशी स्थास्यति । एषा च वानरसेना राक्षसपराजयहेतुकमुन्नतं पदमवाप्स्यतीति । एवं वर्णलोपेन रावणोक्तेरर्थान्तरप्रतिपादकत्वं संपादितमिति शब्दचमत्कारः स्पष्टः । ईदृशं पद्यं दुष्करमिति कश्चिद् बभाषे ; एष च ग्रन्थकारः तमधिक्षेपं मत्वा, ईदृशान्यपि पद्यानि अनायासेन रचयितुं शक्नोमीति प्रदर्शयितुमिच्छन् नव पद्यानि तथाविधानि निर्माय ग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् समयोजयत् । तदाह —

“भवित्री रम्भोर्वित्यनभिनवपद्यं यदिह त-

द्विधं पद्यं त्वेवासुकरमिति कस्यापि वचसा ।

दशास्योक्तित्रयङ्घ्रिक्षितिदुहितृवागन्त्यचरण-

स्फुटैकार्थं चोक्तं सुललितमिह श्लोकनवकम् ॥” (सीता-झरी. श्लो. 105)

इति ।

नवसु श्लोकेषु कविरिमां स्पष्टार्थप्रत्युत्तरशैलामन्वसरत् । तेष्वयमाद्यः श्लोकः —

“रामायातिपटुत्वमेव समरे व्यक्तं भवेन्मामकं

राकेशोपमितं ममैव भुवने जानीहि सीते यशः ।

राजीवेऽपि गतस्पृहस्तव मुखं सानन्दमालोकये  
रावणं विरह्य तत्पुनरपि ब्रूहि क्षपाटाधम ॥”

(श्लो. 67)

इति ।

अत्र प्रथमस्य रावणस्य परित्यागे कृते,

“मायातिपटुत्वमेवसमरे व्यक्तं भवेन्मामकं  
केशोपमितं ममैव भुवने जानोहि सीते यशः ।  
जीवेऽपि गतस्पृहस्तव मुखं सानन्दमालोकये”

इति पाठान्तरं निष्पद्यते । अस्याश्च रावणोक्तेरिदं तात्पर्यं फलति यद् -- “अहं रामेण सह समरारम्भे मायापाटवमेव प्रकटीकरिष्यामि, वस्तुतः शत्रुतोषकृतः पराक्रमस्याभावात् । अत एव लोके कृष्णवर्णं केशं मम यशस उपमानमुदाहरन्ति । हे सीते ! त्वन्मुखावलोकनस्य फलं मम मरणमेव भविष्यतीति जानन्नपि प्राणेषु निःस्पृहस्तव मुखं पश्यामी”ति । एवं सीतायाः प्रत्युक्तौ स्पष्टार्थैः शब्दैः कस्यचिद्गणस्य लोप एव विधीयते । गूढमर्थान्तरं नास्ति ।

किन्तु प्रतिभाविशेषभूषितोऽसौ ग्रन्थकारः ईदृशीमश्लिष्टशब्दां स्पष्टार्थां प्रत्युक्तिमुपनिबध्य तावता न संजुतोष । सीतायाः प्रत्युक्तावपि कञ्चिदापाततः प्रतीयमानमर्थं निवेश्य, गूढार्थान्तरैः श्लिष्टैः शब्दैर्वर्णलोपं, वर्णादेशं, वर्णागमं वा विधाय, तेन रावणोक्तोनामर्थान्तरपरत्वसंपादनेन कमप्यधिकं चमत्कारमुत्पादयितुमैच्छत् । वस्तुतः, ईदृशानि गूढार्थान्तरगर्भाणि पद्यान्येव दुष्कराणीति तेषामुपनिबन्धे महान्त-मादरं बभार । पञ्चाशत् पद्यानि एवं प्रकाराणि निर्ममे । एकमुदाहरणं दृश्यताम् —

“पश्याम्यन्यमुदारभोगविषये तुल्यं न मे कञ्चिद-

प्यन्यः कोऽहमिवास्ति भ.जनमुमापत्यादरस्यापि च ।

मद्वद् भूतनये मुखाब्जविकसत्तज्जा रणे कः श्रुतः

पापिञ्जल्प यथास्पृहं मम पुनः मौनादरो रोचते ॥” (श्लो. २०)

इति । अत्र हि रावणः त्रिभिः पदैः ,

“उदारस्य भोगस्य विषये मम कश्चित्तुल्यो नास्ति, उमापतेरादरस्य पात्रमप्यहमेव, रणे च ममैव सुखाब्जे तेजो विकसति, नान्यस्य,” इति निर्लज्जमात्मानं श्लाघते । सीता त्वेवं प्रत्याह — “रे पापिन्, स्वेच्छया यत्किञ्चिद् वद । अहं तु मौनमेव रोचयामि” इति । प्रतिवचननिगूढार्थस्तु, ‘मौ मुकारे आदरो न रोचते । सुवर्णविहाय इमामेव तवोक्तिं पुनः पठ । मुकारपरित्यक्तां तव वाचमहं बहुमन्ये’ इति । एवं च रावणोक्तौ सुवर्णः परित्यक्तव्य इति वर्णलोपः श्लेषेण विधीयते । तथा कृते लोपे रावणोक्तिरेवं रूपान्तरं प्रतिपद्यते —

“पश्याम्यन्यदारभोगविषये तुल्यं न मे कश्चिद-

प्यन्यः कोऽहमिवास्ति भाजनमापत्त्या दरस्यापि च ।

मद्वद् भूतनये रवाब्जविकसत्तेजा रणे कः श्रुतः” इति ।

अस्यायमर्थः — ‘अन्यदारभोगविषये परस्त्रीसंभोगे कश्चिन्मम तुल्यो नास्ति । आपत्त्या विपत्तेः, दरस्य भयस्य च पात्रमहमिव न कोऽप्यन्यो वर्तते । रणभूमौ च खाब्जमिव आकाशकमलमिव विकसत्तेजः कस्य वा अन्यस्य संभवति ? यथा आकाशकमलमसंभवि, तथैव रणाङ्गणे मम मुखे तेजोऽपि असंभवीति जानीहि’ इति । एवं सुवर्णलोपात् रावणोक्तेरर्थान्तरबोधकत्वं कविना सम्यङ् निर्व्यूढम् ।

एतादृशानि पद्यानि प्रतिभासंयत्रोऽपि कविः अनायासेन रचयितुं न शक्नोति । वर्णमात्रविकारेण अर्थान्तरप्रतीतिं जनयितुं क्षमाणां शब्दानामन्वेषणे महान् प्रयत्नोऽपेक्ष्यते । एवं महान्तं बुद्धिबलेश्चमनुभूय विवक्षितविरुद्धार्थद्वयप्रतिपादनक्षमान् शब्दानन्विष्य श्लोकान् रचयितुं प्रवृत्तोऽयं महामतिः कविद्वयः, त्रिशता वर्षैः पञ्चाशदेव पद्यानि रचयामासेति पठामः । शतं पद्यानि ग्रथनीयानीति प्रतिज्ञां कृत्वापि तां प्रतिज्ञां पूरयितुमसमर्थो भूत्वा, पञ्चाशदेव पद्यानि निर्माय श्रान्तोऽयं ग्रन्थकारस्तावति विररामेति तस्यैव निम्नलिखितात् पद्यादवसीयते —

“अन्यूनैः शतकृत् कृतिः स्वयमियं गूढार्थम्यैर्युता

कर्तव्येति ससंवेदप्यतिचिरश्रान्तो मतिक्षोभतः ।

विश्रान्तोऽस्यवशिष्टमर्धशतकं संग्रथ्य मत्संविदा

सार्धं यः परिपूरयेत् कृतिमिमां तस्यै गृह्यं नमः ॥” (श्लो. 104)

इति ।

अत्र पूर्वार्धे, स्वयं शतकादन्यूनैः पद्यैरियं कृतिः संग्रथ्य रचनीयेति कवेः संवित्= प्रतिज्ञा स्पष्टमुल्लिखिता दृश्यते । तथापि त्रिशता वर्षैः पञ्चाशदेव पद्यानि ग्रथितवानसौ कविः, 'मतिक्रोभतः श्रान्तः' विश्रान्तो बभूव । अपेक्षितशब्दार्थयोजनायां महान्तं मतिक्रोभनवाप्य, 'एतावदेव मया कर्तुमशक्यत, इतः परं न शक्यते' इति स्वयं विरराम । उत्तरार्धे च यदि कश्चिद्विपश्चिदवशिष्टानि पञ्चाशत् पद्यानि निर्माय मम प्रतिज्ञां पूरयिष्यति, तर्हि, तस्मै महोपकारिणे सहस्रं नमांसि समर्पयिष्यामीत्याह । एष ग्रन्थः अद्यापि तथैवाध्यावशिष्टः असमाप्तश्च वर्तते ; न केनापि कविना ग्रन्थ-कारस्येनामिच्छां पूरयित्वा तस्य नमांसि प्राप्तानीति प्रत्यक्षमेतत् \* ।

केचिदस्य ग्रन्थस्य गुणदोषौ परीक्षेन् । गुणानुपलभ्य प्रशंसेयुः, दोषानवलोक्य निन्देयुः । तेषां गुणदोषविवेककारिणां श्लाघेव निन्दापि स्वागतमर्हति । किन्तु ये प्राचीनतापक्षपातिनः परम्पराशरणा विमर्शकाः, ग्रन्थकारस्याधुनिकत्वादेव इमं ग्रन्थं गुणरहितं मन्यन्ते, दोषानपश्यन्तोऽपि दुराग्रहेण तानारोपयन्ति दूषयन्ति च तान् प्रति कविरेवमाह —

“ग्रन्थं वीक्ष्य गुणानुगुणववहिता निर्धार्य नन्दन्ति ये  
ये निन्दन्ति च तांश्च तांश्च शिरसा भक्त्यैव वन्दामहे ।  
कर्तुः सांप्रतिकत्वमेव परमो दोषः कृतेरित्यमू-  
मस्त्वष्ट्वैव हुमित्यनादरकृतां नामापि न ब्रूमहे ॥” (श्लो. 10 )

इति । ये विद्वांसः पक्षपातरहिताः सन्तो दोषानाविष्कुर्वन्ति तानपि शिरसा वन्दामहे इति ग्रन्थकारः स्वस्य विद्वज्जनविधेयत्वं प्रकाशयति । ये तु ग्रन्थमनवलोक्यैव, आधुनिकस्य कवेरियं रचनेत्येतावता तिरस्कारं दर्शयन्ति, तानसौ नाम्ना ग्रहीतुमप्य-यो यान् गोष्ठीप्रवेशानर्हान् मन्यते ।

अयं कविः मैसूरराज्ये लब्धप्रतिष्ठस्य विद्वद्रेण्यस्य श्री वेङ्कटरमणमूरेस्तनूजः, चामराजनगर श्रीकण्ठशास्त्रिणोऽनुजश्चेति ज्ञायते । पित्रा भ्रात्रा च विविधासु विद्यासु

कनूतुनण्डलान्तगत औङ्कुरनिवासिना बच्चु सुव्वरायगुप्तेन परिशिष्टाः पञ्चाशच्छ्लोकाः विरचिताः । ग्रन्थकृत्रा विरचितया संस्कृतव्याख्यया, यन्. वि. कृष्णमूर्तिणा विरचितया आंग्लभाषाटीकाया, डि. वेङ्कटमुक्कयेन विरचितया हिन्दीभाषाटीकया च सवलितः अयं ग्रन्थः 'अभिनवसीतारागणसंवादझरी' इति नाम्ना १९६६ तमे वर्षे ग्रन्थकारेण स्वयं प्रकाशितः —

विनीतोऽयं विद्वान् तावुभौ सादरं स्मरन्, नैच्यानुसन्धानेन स्वस्य निरहंकारत्वमपि प्रतिपादयति । एतदाह —

“शृङ्गेरीपुरशारदाङ्घ्रिकमलद्वन्द्वं बहून् वत्सरान्  
सेवित्वा तदनुग्रहेण परमं वैदुष्यमासेदुषः ।  
श्रीमद्वेङ्कटशब्दपूर्वमण्डाभिख्यस्य विद्वन्मणे-  
स्मूनोर्वागिह चामराजनगरीरामस्य जीयादियम् ॥” (श्लो. 107)

इति । अस्य श्लोकस्य व्याख्यायां स्वयमाचष्टे — “सूनोः पुत्रस्य । कनीयस इति भावः । ज्यायसस्तु धातुकारिका, धातुरूपप्रकाशिकाद्युद्धन्थरचनतः श्रुततमेन चामराजनगर श्रीकण्ठसुधा नाम्ना प्रथमानत्वात्” इति । एवं पितुर्भ्रातुश्च व्याकरणादि नानाशास्त्रेषु पाण्डित्यमपौ प्रथयति ।

स्वयमप्येष कविः शास्त्रमर्मज्ञो बभूवेति ग्रन्थादस्मादेव निश्चीयते । तथापि पश्यतास्य विनयं गर्वशून्यत्वं च, यदाह —

“तर्कव्याकरणादिषु कचिदपि प्रज्ञाविशेषाद्यशो  
नैत्रामोद्विदुषां वरस्य जगति ख्यातस्य पुत्रोऽपि यः ।  
व्यर्थं हन्त स चामराजनगरीरामो जनिष्ठः  
सीतारावणवादक्षयवतरेत् कस्मादतस्माद् भुवि ॥” (श्लो. 108)

इति । सीतारावणसंवादक्षरीत्येष ग्रन्थस्तस्मात् चामराजनगरी रामादेवावततार ; तस्मात्तस्य जन्म सकलमेव बभूवेति ग्रन्थकारः स्वयमात्मानमभिनन्दति । अस्य ग्रन्थस्य निर्माणेनैव कवेर्जन्म सकलमासीदिति “अत एव सकलं तस्य जन्मेति सर्वमनवद्यम्” इत्यस्मात् व्याख्यासमाप्तिवाक्यादवगम्यते ।

एषां च पद्यानां श्लिष्टार्थगर्भितत्वात् व्याख्यामन्तरेण दुर्वोधतया व्याख्याया आवश्यकत्वमालोचयन् ग्रन्थकारः स्वयमेव स्वाभिप्रायप्रकाशनपरां टीकामपि विलिख्य संयोजयामास । एवं हि मम्मटादयोऽपि स्वनिर्मितं मूलग्रन्थं स्वयमेव व्याचष्टुः । व्याख्यां विना पाठकाः गूढमर्थं न जानीयुरिति तेषामुपकाराय व्याख्यां लिखन्नपि ग्रन्थकारः ग्रन्थचारास्यमणेषां सरलैः संक्षिप्तैश्च शब्दैः प्रकाशयन् विदुषामपि उपकार-

मादधाति । एवं रसभरिता इमे श्लोका दृश्यन्ते । यदर्थं जानतेऽपि, विदुषोऽपि तमर्थं वर्णयितुं व्याख्यातुं च रसिका उत्सहेरन् । सीतारावणसंवादममुं शिशुपा-  
शाखान्तरे विलीनो हनूमानश्रौषीत् ; श्रुत्वा च स बहुश्रुतो मेधावी तमशेषं संवादं यथा  
श्रुतं धारयामास ; रामसमीपं प्रतिनिवृत्तश्च तस्मै तं संवादं विज्ञापयामास । रामस्तु  
स्वयं गूढार्थं जानन्नपि हनूमतो विवरणमपि लेभे । तदाह कविः —

“इत्यूनां षष्ठिमेकेन पद्यानि पवनात्मजः ।

अपि रामाय विदुषे विवृण्वन्नर्थतोऽब्रवीत् ॥” (श्लो. 76)

इति । एवं चात्र व्याचक्षे —

‘विदुषेऽपि स्वत एवार्थं जानतेऽपि रामाय अर्थतः विवृण्वन् व्याख्यानरीत्याऽर्थं  
चोपपादयन्नित्यर्थः । प्रत्युक्तिचातुर्यजनितहर्षपारवश्यादिति भावः’ इति । एनसौ  
ग्रन्थकारः स्वयं व्याख्यां विलिख्य न केवलं मन्दानामपि तु विदुषामप्युपकारमापादयत् ।

अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे आहत्य श्लोकानामष्टोत्तरं शतमुपलभ्यते । तत्र प्रथमं  
षोडशिभिः श्लोकैः ग्रन्थकारो वक्तव्यस्यार्थस्य भूमिकामेव बध्नाति । प्रथमे श्लोके  
भगवन्तं विनायकं विघ्नापसरणाय प्रणमति —

“क्रीडारुष्टाद्रिजाडिघ्नप्रणतशिवशिरश्चन्द्रखण्डे कराग्रं  
लीलालोलं प्रसार्य स्फुरदमलविसाशङ्कया कण्टुकामः ।  
उद्यद्धृद्यस्मिताभ्यामहमहमिकयालिङ्ग्यमानः शिवाभ्यां  
कश्चिन्नश्चिन्तितार्थं कलयतु कलभो बाललीलाभिरामः ॥”

इति ।

अस्मिन् ग्रन्थे वर्णचित्रात्मके यद्यपि शब्दचमत्कार एव प्रधानं, तथापि अर्थ-  
चमत्कारस्य नात्यन्ताभाव इति प्रतिजानीते —

“अर्थगुष्ठयविनाभूतशब्दचित्रातिदुर्घटा ।

सीतारावणसंवादझरीति ग्रथ्यते कृतिः ॥” (श्लो. 2)

इति । एवं चात्र शब्दस्येव अर्थस्यापि चमत्कारो विशेषेण निरूपणीय इति फलितम् ।

ततो रावणः सीतां हत्वा लङ्कायामशोकवने स्थापितां तां वशयितुमिच्छन्  
रामनिन्दापराणि आत्मश्लाघापराणि च वाक्यानि निरर्गलं जजल्पेति कथामुपक्षिपति ।

“तदानीं निर्निद्रो रजनिचरमांशे दशमुखः  
स्मरार्तः सीतायाः सविधनुपयातो मम वशे ।  
इयं स्यादेवं चेदिति शुभगुणानात्मानि मृषा  
मृषा दोषानाह स्म च मुहुरनेकान् रघुपतां ॥” (श्लो. 6)

इति । तस्य च श्लिष्टार्थकं प्रत्युत्तरं सीता बभाषे ; स तु मूढस्तस्या गूढमभिसंधिं  
वेत्तुमसमर्थः पुनः पुनस्तां कर्णारुन्तुदैर्वचनैरुद्वेजयामास । अन्ते च सा स्पष्टार्थकं  
प्रतिवचनमूचे । ततोऽयं लज्जितो रावणस्तूष्णीं बभूव । तदेतदाह —

“साध्याः षिट्मभिक्रुधा प्रतिवचो यादृक्क्षमं तादृशीं  
प्रत्युक्तिं विशदार्थिकां जनकजाखयान्ती तदभ्यन्तरे ।  
अर्थेनातिनिगूहितेन सकलां तस्योक्तिमर्थान्तरं  
निन्ये यस्य स वेदिता यदि पुनर्हीणो न किञ्चिद्देत् ॥ (श्लो. 7)

तदज्ञानात्तस्मिन्नविरतविवक्षे सति पुनः-  
पुनः पौलस्त्ये सा जनकतनयार्ताव कुपिता ।  
स्फुटोस्य स्रोक्यैव स्वयमभिभवोस्त्वित्यति परि-  
स्फुटीकृत्यैवार्थं कतिचन जगाद प्रतिगिरः ॥” (श्लो. 8)

इति ।

तमेतं सीतारावणसंवादमवधानेन श्रुतवानाञ्जनेयः श्रीरामचन्द्रमेवं विज्ञापयामास ।

“यत्सौशील्यं जनकदुहितुर्यस्त्वयि प्रेमभूमा  
यस्त्वच्छौर्यप्रणयगरिमा याप्यवज्ञा दशास्त्ये ।  
या चाहन्ता निशिचरपतेस्तत्समस्तं व्यनक्ति  
प्रत्यक्षं मे रघुवर तयोः संप्रवृत्तो विवादः ॥ (श्लो. 12)

शतार्धश्लिष्टार्थप्रतिरुणितियुक्पद्यविधया  
स्फुटैकार्थप्रत्युक्त्युपहितनवश्लोकविधया ।

प्रवृत्ते तं वादं दृढमवधृतं मे हृदि हठा-  
न्मुखादद्योद्यन्तं रघुकुलमणे शृण्ववहितः ॥ (श्लो. 15)

इत्युदीर्य पवमाननन्दनः शब्दशास्त्रविदुषां पुरोगमः ।  
आदरादवधृतं श्रुतं पुरा, तं विवादमवदद् यथाक्रमम् ॥” (श्लो. 16)

इति ।

अत्र गूढार्थप्रत्युक्तिगर्भेषु श्लोकेषु, अर्थान्तरप्रतिपत्तिहेतोर्वर्णविकारस्य त्रयः प्रकाराः संभवन्ति । लोपः, आदेशः, आगमश्चेति प्रसिद्धा एते प्रकाराः सर्वैर्ज्ञायन्ते एव । रावणस्योक्तिषु सीता यदि कस्यचिद्वर्णस्य लोपं विधाय स्वाभीष्टमर्थान्तरं साधयति, तर्हि तदेतत् ‘च्याविताक्षरं’ नाम चित्रं भवति । यथा —

“परिक्षीणास्यः समरभुवि रक्षः कुलपतिः  
सलज्जः स्वस्तुत्याममलहितमार्गेकपथिकः ।  
प्रणम्रस्त्रालभ्यः सुमुखिविलसत्कीर्तिरिति च  
श्रुतो नाहं किं, रेऽधम मुहुरलं त्वां श्रुतवती ॥” (श्लो. 17)

इति । अत्र ‘श्रुतो नाहं किं’ मित्यन्तं रावणस्य वचनम् । स्पष्टार्थकानीमानि पदानि व्याख्यां नापेक्षन्ते । सीता तु “त्वां श्रुतवती । श्रोतव्यं सर्वं वृत्तान्तं श्रुतवती, न पुनः किञ्चित् श्रोतुमिच्छामि । मुहुरलं, पुनः पुनर्मा वादीः” इति प्रतिभाषते । अत्र निगूढमर्थान्तरं तु, ‘त्वां मुहुरलं लकाररहितं श्रुतवती’ति । वाच्यवाचकयोरभेदा-  
ध्यवसायोत्र द्रष्टव्यः । लकाररहितैरेभिरेव शब्दैः प्रतिपाद्यं त्वां श्रुतवतीत्यर्थः फलति । एवं च तत्रोक्तौ लकारस्त्याज्य इति लोपो विधीयते । लकाररहिता च रावणोक्तिः ,

“परिक्षीणास्यः समरभुवि रक्षः कुपतिः  
सलज्जः स्वस्तुत्या मम हितमार्गेकपथिकः ।  
प्रणम्रस्त्रालभ्यः सुमुखि विसत्कीर्तिरिति च  
श्रुतो नाहं किम्”

इत्येवं रूपा पर्यवस्यति । दशास्यस्य रावणस्य रणाङ्गणे, आस्यानि परिक्षीयन्ते । एष रक्षसां विनाशहेतुः कुपतिः । आत्मश्लाघायां सलज्जः सदा सन्नद्धस्तिष्ठति । अमहिते



सद्भिरनादते मार्गे अयमेक एव साग्रहं गच्छति । स्त्रीभ्योऽपि प्रणम्रोऽयं, कामुकत्वात् । अत्र 'प्रणम्रः स्त्रीभ्य' इति पदयोः संनिवेशे 'खर्परे शरिं वा विसर्गलोपो वक्तव्य' इति वार्तिकेन विहितो लोपः । प्रणामेनैव स्त्रियोऽनेन वशीक्रियन्त इति तात्पर्यम् । अत एवास्य सत्कीर्तिविरहः फलितः । एवं लकारलोपे कृते रावणोक्तेरर्थान्तरप्रत्यायकत्वादिदं च्याविताक्षरं नाम चित्रम् । तस्येदं लक्षणमाहुः —

“कस्मिंश्चिच्च्याविते वर्णे यत्रार्थोन्यः प्रतीयते ।

चित्त्वं तदेव विज्ञेयं च्याविताक्षरनामकम् ॥”

इति ।

यत्र त्वेकस्य वर्णस्य स्थाने वर्णान्तरमादिश्यते, तेन चार्थान्तरमापाद्यते, तच्चित्त्वं प्रतिदत्ताक्षरं नाम प्रसिध्यति । तस्य चेदं लक्षणमुच्यते —

“च्यावितस्यास्पदेऽन्येन प्रतिदत्तेन केनचित् ।

प्रतीयतेऽन्यो यत्रार्थः प्रतिदत्ताक्षरं हि तत् ॥”

इति । तस्येदमुदाहरणं ग्रन्थकारो दर्शयति । —

“स्मृत्वा मां हृदि जायतेऽतिविनयः क्रव्यादमात्रेऽपि ते,

भर्ता भूमिसुते सदानृतगुणस्तेऽतोऽपि सौख्यं कुतः ।

जाते मय्यसुनायके तव सुखं स्यादेव किं दूयसे

किं रे जल्पसि दुर्वचः खलमते भूयोऽपि नेदं वद ॥” (श्लो. 21)

इति । अत्र तृतीयपादान्तं रावणस्य वचनम् । अस्यार्थः —

“हे सीते, मां रक्षसामीश्वरं रावणं स्मृत्वा दीनस्तत्र भर्ता सामान्यराक्षसविषयेऽपि विनयपूर्णं व्यवहारमालम्बते । तस्य गुणाः अनृताः । तस्मात्तत्र कथं सुखं जायेत ? मां तव प्राणनाथं भजस्व ; तदैव तव सुखं संभाव्यते, नान्यथा” इति । सीता त्वाह — “इदं भूयो न वद” इति । अस्येदमर्थान्तरं, ‘ने नकारस्य विषये दं दकारं वद’ इति । नकारं च्यावयित्वा तस्य स्थाने दकारं प्रतिददाति, आदेशं निदधाति । एवं नकारस्थाने दकारादेशे कृते, एषैव रावणोक्तिः,

“स्मृत्वा मां हृदि जायतेऽतिविदयः क्रव्यादमात्रेऽपि ते,

भर्ता भूमिसुते सदावृतगुणस्तेऽतोऽपि सौख्यं कुतः ।

जाते मय्यसुदायके तव सुखं स्यादेव किं दूयसे”

इति परिणमति । एवं च, “मामपराधिनं स्मृत्वा तव भर्ता निरपराधे यस्मिन्कस्मिन्-  
श्चिद्राक्षसमात्रेऽपि निर्दयो भवति । स तावत्सद्गिराट्पतानां शिष्टसम्मतानां गुणानां  
संगमस्थानम् । अस्मादपि अधिकं सुखं कस्मादन्यस्मात्त्वया लब्धुं शक्येत ? मा च  
दूयस्व । अचिरेणैव रणेऽहमस्मून् दास्यामि परित्यक्ष्यामि । तदा रामेण संगता त्वं सुखं  
प्राप्स्यसि” इति तात्पर्यं स्पष्टमवगम्यते । एवमत्र नकारं विहाय तस्य स्थाने दकारस्य  
ग्रहणादिदं प्रतिदत्ताक्षरं नाम चित्रं संपद्यते ।

इदमप्यन्यदुदाहरणं पश्येम —

“रामो भूषितवान्निजेन जनुषा प्राभाकरो संततिं  
त्यक्त्वा हस्तगतां श्रियं निजयशो दूरीकरोति स्म यत् ।  
तं श्रुत्वा सदयो भवान्यतितरां मैथिल्यहं त्वत्कृते  
पापिन्नेतददम्भवत्तव वचः श्राव्यं न कैः सादरम् ॥” (श्लो. 32)

इति । अस्यर्थः — “रामः स्वजन्मना सूर्यवंशं दूषयामास । स हि हस्तप्राप्तमपि  
राज्यलक्ष्मीं निराचकार, ततश्च महतीमपख्यातिं लेभे । तथापि त्वदर्थमस्मिन्नपि मम  
दयोपजायते” इति । सीता प्रत्याह — “रे पापिन्, दम्भयुक्तं तव वचः संतापं जनयति ।  
दम्भरहितं चेदिदं ते वचः सर्वे सादरं शृणुयुः” इति । अस्य प्रतिवचनस्येदमर्थान्तरं  
यद् “अदं दकाररहितं भवत् भकारसहितं च तव वचः श्रवणार्हं भवती”ति । एवं  
दकारस्य स्थाने भकारादेशे कृते रावणस्येदं वचनम् ।

“रामो भूषितवान्निजेन जनुषा प्राभाकरो संततिं  
त्यक्त्वा हस्तगतां श्रियं निजयशो भूरीकरोति स्म यत् ।  
तं श्रुत्वा सभयो भवान्यतितरां मैथिल्यहं त्वत्कृते”

इत्याकारं विपरिणमति । “रामस्य जन्मना सूर्यवंशो भूषितः, तेन च प्राप्तमपि राज्यं  
पितृवाक्यपरिपालनार्थं त्यजता भूरि यशः समार्जितं, तं च सत्यपराक्रमं महावीरं श्रुत्वा  
त्वदपहरणापराधो सभयो भवामी”ति रावणस्येमे शब्दा अर्थान्तरमभिदधति । एवं  
वर्णदेशस्यार्थान्तरहेतुत्वादिदमपि प्रतिदत्ताक्षरं नाम चित्रमिति स्पष्टम् ।

तृतीयश्च प्रकारो वर्णागमरूपोऽद्यावशिष्यते । यत्र कश्चिदधिको वर्ण आसज्य-  
मानः स्वाभोष्टमर्थान्तरं संपादयति, तदधिदत्ताक्षरं नाम चित्रमाहुः ।

“कस्मिंश्चिदधिके वर्णे दत्तेऽर्थो यत्र भिद्यते ।

अधिदत्ताक्षरं नाम चित्तं तदिति बुध्यताम् ॥”

इति हि तस्य लक्षणमामनन्ति । तस्येदमुदाहरणम् —

“तापोन्मेषविवर्जितो युधि मितौजस्काभिमुख्यातिगः

सीते सादितदुर्जयप्रतिरथः कृत्या विमूढाशयः ।

स्थानायत्तजयेन्दिरश्च किमहं श्रोत्रेऽस्मि लभो न ते

प्रागेव त्वमरे प्रसङ्गत इह श्रोत्रेऽसि लभो मुहुः ॥” (श्लो. 26)

इति । अत्रापि तृतीयपादान्ता रावणस्योक्तिः । स ह्येवमात्मानं प्रशंसति —  
 “अहं तावत् समरे तापोन्मेषेण दुःखानुभवेन विवर्जितस्त्यक्तोऽस्मि । सर्वशत्रुसंहार-  
 कारिणो मम संतापं को जनयेदिति भावः । मितौजस्कानां परिमितशक्तीनां शत्रू-  
 णामाभिमुख्यमतीत्य गच्छामि ; अल्पवीर्यान् क्षुद्रानुपेक्षे इत्यर्थः । दुर्जयान् पराक्रम-  
 धनान् प्रतिस्थान् शत्रून् सादयामि मारयामीति यावत् । कृत्येषु ममाशयः अविमूढो  
 भवति, युक्तायुक्तविवेकपूर्वकं कार्यं करोमीति यावत् । अत एव मे जयेन्दिरा  
 जयलक्ष्मीः स्थानायत्ता ; मदीयं स्थानं विहाय न याति । अत्रैव स्थिरतया तिष्ठतीत्यर्थः ।  
 एतादृशविशेषणविशिष्टोऽहं किं ते श्रोत्रपथं न प्राप्तः ?” इति रावणः सीतां  
 पृच्छति । सा तु, त्वं कस्माच्चित्प्रसङ्गविशेषात् पूर्वमेव मया श्रुतः, अद्य पुनरेकवारं  
 श्रोतुं नेच्छामीत्याह । गूढार्थस्तु, ‘अरे, त्वं प्रागेव स्वगुणप्रतिपादकविशेषणानामादावेव  
 प्रसङ्गतः प्रेत्युपसर्गेण विशिष्टः श्रुतः’ इति । एवं च तापोन्मेषेत्यादिविशेषणानामादौ  
 प्रशब्दं योजयित्वा एतदेव वाक्यं पुनः पठेति फलति । अयं हि वर्णागमः अधिकस्य  
 वर्णस्योपजननात् । एवं प्रशब्दयोगे सति —

“प्रतापोन्मेषविवर्जितो युधि प्रमितौजस्काभिमुख्यातिगः

सीते प्रसादितदुर्जयप्रतिरथः प्रकृत्या विमूढाशयः ।

प्रस्थानायत्तजयेन्दिरश्च किमहं श्रोत्रेऽस्मि लभो न ते”

इति रावणोक्ते रूपान्तरं जायते । समरे प्रतापोन्मेषेण विवर्जितोऽस्मि, पराक्रमहीनोह-  
 मित्यर्थः । प्रमितं प्रत्यक्षसिद्धमोजो वीर्यं येषां, ते प्रमितौजस्काः प्रख्यातवीर्याः  
 शत्रवः, तैः सह योद्धुमशक्तत्वात् तदाभिमुख्यं वर्जयामीति कातर्यं स्पष्टम् । दुर्जयान्

पराक्रमेण जेतुमशक्यान् प्रतिस्थान् पादपतनादिना प्रसादयामीति दुर्बलत्वेऽपि स्वार्थ-  
साधकस्य क्षुद्रवृत्तिरुदीर्यते । प्रकृत्या स्वभावेनैव विमूढाशयः । एवं महामूर्खत्वं  
घोष्यते । जयलक्ष्मीश्च प्रस्थानायत्ता, ईदृशस्य राज्ञः कुनीतिं दृष्ट्वा पलायने प्रवर्तते ।  
एवमेतानि विशेषणानि वर्णागमादर्थान्तरं बोधयन्तीति इदमधिदत्ताक्षरं चित्रमुच्यते ।

इदमस्य द्वितीयमुदाहरणम् —

“हारौचित्यनिवेदकाखिलगुणः सीतेऽस्म्यहं पश्य मां

सर्गात्यन्तबहिर्भवत्वधिषणापादिस्वरूपोऽस्म्यहम् ।

स्यां चाहं हननत्यगप्यभिमतिस्ते चेत्तथा, रेऽधम

प्राक् संन्यासत एव ते समुचितं वेद्मि स्वरूपं ननु ॥” (श्लो. 34)

इति । अत्र तृतीयपादे तथेत्यन्तं रावणस्य वचनम् । तस्येदं तात्पर्यम् — “मम सर्वे  
गुणाः मां हारेण भूषणाय सत्कर्णीयं चापादयन्ति । हारार्पणं हि गुणवतः  
पुरस्काराय । मम गुणा हारौचित्यं निवेदयन्ति, मम हारार्पणरूपसत्कारयोग्यत्वं  
दर्शयन्ति । मम चेदमसाधारणकान्त्यादिविशिष्टं स्वरूपं ‘असौ रावणः सामान्य-  
सृष्टेर्वहिर्भूतः, न हि सर्वविलक्षणरूपादिगुणगणशाली एष ब्रह्मणा सृष्टो  
भवितुमर्हति, अयं सर्गादत्यन्तं बहिर्भूतः’ इति धिषणां बुद्धिमापादयति । यदि च त्वं  
मांसाहारनिषेवणादुद्विजसे, तर्हि त्वत्कृतेऽहं हननं प्राणिमारणं त्यजेयमपि” इति ।  
सीता तु “ममापहरणकाले रामाद् भीतः संन्यासिवेषच्छत्रः किल त्वमागतः, तेनैव  
तव स्वरूपं व्याख्यातं मन्ये, अलं तेऽनेन अधिकप्रसङ्गेन” इत्याह । तस्या  
निगूढोभिप्रायस्तु, ‘प्राक् विशेषणेभ्यः पूर्वं संन्यासतः समित्यस्योपसर्गस्य विन्यासादेव तव  
स्वरूपं सुष्ठु व्याख्यातं मन्ये’ इति । एतेन हारौचित्येत्यादि विशेषणानामादौ ‘सं’  
शब्दयोगस्य विधानाद्वर्णागमः स्पष्टः । तथा च कृते —

“संहारौचित्यनिवेदकाखिलगुणः सीतेऽस्म्यहं पश्य मां

संसर्गात्यन्तबहिर्भवत्वधिषणापादिस्वरूपोऽस्म्यहम् ।

स्यां चाहं संहननत्यगप्यभिमतिस्ते चेत्तथा”

इति रावणस्य परिदेवितं पर्यवस्यति । “मम सर्वे गुणाः कामक्रोधादिरूपाः संहारौचित्यं  
मम वधार्हत्वमेव निवेदयन्ति । मम परदाहरणादीनि लोकोद्भेगकराणि दुष्कर्माणि

श्रूयमाणानि मम वध्यत्वमेवासंदिग्धं प्रकाशयन्ति । मम चेदं स्वरूपमीदृक् घृणाहेतुः यदेतन्मम संसर्गवाह्यत्वमापादयति । मम स्वरूपमालोक्य सर्वे मां संसर्गानर्हमेव प्रतीयन्ति । तव चेदेवमिच्छा स्यात्तर्हि तव कृते संहननं शरीरमपि त्यजेयम्” इति तात्पर्यमपि स्पष्टम् । एवमत्रापि वर्णागमादर्थान्तरप्रतिपत्तेरधिदत्ताक्षरं चित्रमेतत् ।

एवं लोपमादेशमागमं चोपजीव्य त्रिप्रकाराणि चित्राणि ग्रन्थन्नेष महाकविराह —

“वर्णचित्रेषु शतशः कल्पनीयेषु सत्स्वपि ।

गूढार्थस्यानुकूलानि त्रीण्येवात्र मतानि नः ॥

च्याविताक्षरमित्येकमधिदत्ताक्षरं परम् ।

प्रतिदत्ताक्षरं त्वन्यदित्येव त्रीणि तानि हि ॥

चमत्कारान्तरश्लाघ्याः प्रबन्धाः सन्ति भूरिशः ।

निगूढार्थचमत्कारमेकमेकं क्वचित्क्वचित् ॥

पद्यं वा श्रूयते वाक्यं, न तु द्वित्राणि तान्यपि ॥

अत एव प्रयत्नेन प्रबन्धोऽयं प्रवर्तितः ।

वर्णचित्रात्मकोत्पन्तनिगूढार्थचमत्क्रियः ॥”

इति ।

अस्य ग्रन्थस्य निर्माणे कवेः प्रयत्नः सफलतां प्रापेति तु स्पष्टमेव ।

अद्य कानिचिदतिरमणीयानि पद्यानि परिशीलयेम । इदमेकं च्याविताक्षरं चित्रम् —

“अतल्पं निद्रालू रजनिषु कुवागदुर्गततमो

महाकातर्याढ्यो मनसि विधुतप्रोज्ज्वलयशाः ।

वधान्मांसादानां बहुविमतलाभो जनकजे

कथं श्लाघ्यो रामः, खल तमसकृन्मा स्पृश गिरा ॥” (श्लो. 18)

इति । अत्र कथं श्लाघ्यो राम इत्यन्ता रावणस्योक्तिः । दुर्गततम इति रामस्य राज्य-भ्रष्टस्य दरिद्रत्वं कर्णयति । अत एव रात्रौ शयनार्थं तल्पमप्यस्य नास्तीति निन्दति । मनसि महता कातर्येण युक्त इति पराक्रमविहीनत्वं द्योतयति । अत एवानेन

रणभीरुणा रामेणात्युज्ज्वलं यशो विधुतं त्यक्तमित्याह । जनस्थाने केषांचिद्राक्षसानां वधं कृत्वा रामो बहून् परिपन्थिनो लेभे । एतेनास्य राज्यभ्रष्टस्य वनेचरस्य नष्टभार्यस्य सहायशून्यस्य प्रबलविरोधरूपं महदनर्थान्तरमप्युपस्थितमिति निवेद्यते । सीतायास्तु प्रतिवचनं 'तं रामं तव गिरा मा सृष्टश, तं मा विगर्हिष्ठा' इति । अस्प्रेदं निगूढ-मर्थान्तरं भवति — “तं तकारमसकृत् मा सृष्टश, तकारं वर्जयित्वा पुनरपीदमेव वद” इति । एवं सीताभिप्रायानुसारेण तकारलोपे कृते —

“अल्पं निद्रालू रजनिषु कुवागदुर्गमो  
महाकार्यादथो मनसि विधुप्रोज्ज्वलयशाः ।  
वधान्मांसादानां बहुविमलाभो जनकजे ”

इति रावणोक्ते रूपान्तरमुपजायते । अस्यायमर्थः — रामो मनसि महत्कार्यं चिन्तयति, अत एव रात्रौ स्वल्पां निद्रां लभते । उत्साहशीलस्य अनालस्यस्य निद्राधिक्यं न हि भवति । कुवाचो दुःशीला जना एनं न लभन्त इत्यतो हेतोरयं कुवागदुर्गम उच्यते । विधुश्चन्द्र इव प्रोज्ज्वलमस्य यशः सर्वत्र प्रसरति । राक्षसानां वधादस्य सुखकान्तिः प्रसन्ना विमला च दृश्यते । एवममी एव शब्दास्तकारलोपाद्रामस्य प्रशंसायां पर्यवस्यन्ति ।

च्याविताक्षरस्यैवेदमन्यदुदाहरणं दृश्यताम् —

“जुष्टो मन्त्रिजनेन संगतधिया मद्रन्न कश्चित्प्रभुः  
प्राप्तात्युज्ज्वलकीर्तिसंहतिरहं तैस्तैश्चरितैर्निजैः ।  
रामो नार्हति तुल्यतां जनकजे संग्रामसिंहस्य मे  
सर्वं सत्यमरे परं त्वनुचितः संन्यास एकस्तव ॥” (श्लो. 22)

इति । अत्र तृतीयपादान्तं रावणस्य वाक्यम् । “ममैव मन्त्रिणो धीमन्तः ; एतादृशा निपुणा मन्त्रिणः कस्याप्यन्यस्य राज्ञो न सन्ति । ममैव चरित्राणि सद्भिः श्लाघनीयानि मम महतीं कीर्तिं संपादयन्ति । सङ्ग्रामेषु सिंहस्य मम रामः कथं समतां लभेत ?” इति रावणः निर्लज्जमात्मानं स्तौति । सीता त्वाह “इदं सर्वं तिष्ठतु । एवं वीरो भूत्वा त्वं किमर्थं मम हरणाय संन्यासिवेषमधारयः ? प्राक् तव संन्यास एकः अतीवानुचितः प्रतिभाति” इति । अस्प्रेदं गूढमर्थान्तरं — ‘विशेषणानि त्वयोक्तानि

सर्वाणि तथैव सन्तु । किन्तु समित्ययमुपसर्गः परं न न्यासमर्हति । समुपसर्गस्य परित्यागे कृते सर्वं समञ्जसं भवति” इति ।

एवमुपसर्गलोपे विहिते —

“जुष्टो मन्त्रिजनेन गतधिया मद्रुन्न कश्चित्प्रभुः  
प्राप्तात्युज्ज्वलकीर्तिहतिरहं तैस्तैश्चरित्वैर्निजैः ।  
रामो नार्हति तुल्यतां जनकजे ग्रामसिंहस्य मे”

इति रावणोक्तिर्विपर्यस्यति । रावणस्यैव मन्त्रिणो गतधियः नष्टबुद्धयः । अतो हि ते राजानं विपरीताचारे प्रवर्तयन्ति । एवमधर्माचरणेन रावणस्य कीर्तेर्हतिरजायत । एष रावणः कातरत्वात् रणक्षेत्रात्पलायमानः, ग्रामसिंहः श्वा भवति । कथमस्य समानत्वं महावीरे रामे उपपद्येत ? एवं रावणस्य शब्दैरेव सीता तस्य निन्दां विधत्ते ।

च्याविताक्षरस्यैव ग्रीणीमानि उदाहरणाणि विदुषां चमत्कारमादधति । तेषु प्रथममेतत् —

“त्वल्लाभे मम निग्रहे जययशो लाभेप्यसत्यादरो  
भर्ता ते मिथिलेन्द्रपुञ्ज्यसमरश्लाघ्यः क्व वा तिष्ठतु ।  
मय्याधेहि दृशं दयारसर्हितां क्षिप्रं भवेच्छर्म ते  
किं संजल्पसि यामिनीचरकुलोच्छेदिनरे दुर्मते ॥” (श्लो. 24)

इति । रावणः “सीताया लाभे, शत्रुनिग्रहे च रामस्य सत्य आदरो नास्ति । शत्रुजयायापेक्षितः पराक्रमो नास्तीति स्वकी दौर्बल्यं जानन्नयं रामः असत्यमादरं कामं प्रकाशयतु । किन्तु जययशोलाभार्थं कमपि प्रयत्नमसौ न करिष्यति । एवं रणभीरुत्वादसमरश्लाघ्यः । समरे श्लाघां नार्हतीति यावत् । हे सीते, दयारसेन हितां दृष्टिं मय्याधेहि । मां दयया वीक्षस्व । तावता महत्ते कल्याणं भविष्यति” इत्याह । क्रोधवशंगता सीता तु, ‘दुर्मते किमेतदसङ्गतं संजल्पसी’त्याक्षिपति । अत्रेदमर्थान्तरं सुलभम् — ‘सं सकारं किं जल्पसि ? अनुचितोऽयं सकारः परित्यज्यताम्’ इति । तथा च सकारलोपोऽत्र विधीयते । लुप्ते च सकारे —

“त्वल्लाभे मम निग्रहे जययशो लाभेप्यत्यादरो  
भर्ता ते मिथिलेन्द्रपुञ्ज्यमरश्लाघ्यः क्व वा तिष्ठतु ।  
मय्याधेहि दृशं दयारहितां क्षिप्रं भवेच्छर्म ते”

इति रावणोक्ती रूपान्तरं भजते । असत्यादरः संप्रति अत्यादरो भवति ; असमर-  
श्लाघ्यश्च अमरश्लाघ्यो जायते ; दयारसहिता दयारहिता भवति । एवमेकवर्णलोपेन  
रावणोक्तेरर्थान्तरापत्तिः स्पष्टा चमत्कारमावहति ।

द्वितीयमुदाहरणं चैतत् —

“क्षोणी नन्दिनि कोऽस्ति भासुरतमो मद्रत् त्रिलोक्यामपि  
स्यात्किं मे चरिते श्रुते नवसुधोदान्तश्रुतीच्छा सताम् ।  
मां लब्ध्वा सुखराशिभागियमिति प्रख्यायसे नान्यथा  
वाचोस्याः कुमते भवेत्तव वृथा सुत्यागतः सार्थता ॥” (श्लो. 25)

इति । अत्रापि तृतीयपादान्तं रावणस्य वचनम् । “अहमेक एव तेजस्वी लोक-  
त्रयोऽपि भासुरतमः । मम वृत्तान्तमाकर्णयन्तः सन्तः नवसुधाया वृत्तान्तमपि श्रोतुं  
नोत्सहेरन् । मम चरितं सुधाया अप्यधिकं माधुर्यं धत्ते । मां पतिं भजन्ती  
सुखराशिमेषा भजत इति ख्यातिं प्राप्स्यसि” इति रावणः स्वगुणान् प्रशंसति ।  
सीता तु प्रतिवक्ति — “तव असुत्यागतः मरणादेव, एषा ते वाक् सार्थकत्वं  
भजती” ति । अस्या अर्थान्तरं तु — ‘सुत्यागतः सुशब्दस्य वर्जनात्तव वागर्थवती  
भविता, नान्यथा’ इति । सुशब्दलोपे कृते,

“क्षोणीनन्दिनि कोऽस्ति भारतमो मद्रत् त्रिलोक्यामपि  
स्यात्किं मे चरिते श्रुते न वधोदन्तश्रुतीच्छा सताम् ।  
मां लब्ध्वा खराशिभागियमिति प्रख्यायसे नान्यथा”

इति रावणवाक्यस्य स्वरूपविपरिणामो निष्पद्यते । तस्य चायमर्थः — “लोकत्रयेऽपि  
अहमेक एव सर्वाधिकपापकारित्वाद् भारतमः । मम वृत्तान्तमाकर्णयन्तो जनाः ,  
मम वधमपि श्रोतुमिच्छेयुः । मम भार्या भविष्यसि चेत्त्वां गर्दभभक्षकस्य पत्नीं  
वदिष्यन्ति । अहं हि गर्दभमांसभक्षणशीलः । [खरमश्नाति ताच्छील्येनेति  
खराशीति व्युत्पत्तेः । ] इति ।”

तृतीयं च पद्यमिदम् —

“निश्चिन्तस्य बुधैर्विपत्त्युपनतावङ्गारदासौजमो  
दुस्साधानपि भञ्जनाद्वशयतः शश्वद्रिपूनाहवे ।  
तुल्यो मे किमु भङ्गवानिति सदा रामः श्रुतो भूसुते  
श्राव्यं नास्त्यपि विन्दुमात्रमनृते पापिन्वचस्यत्र ते ॥” (श्लो. 36)



इति । भूसुते इत्यन्तस्य रावणवाक्यस्येदं तात्पर्यम् — “अहं तावद् बुधजनयोगात् विपत्तिप्राप्तौ निश्चिन्तोऽस्मि । विद्वांसो मन्त्रिणो मम विपत्तिं सर्वथा वारयन्ति । अङ्गारवन्मम तेजोऽपि दीप्तं शतूणां भयमापादयति । दुस्साधाः अन्यैः जेतुमशक्याः प्रबला रिपवोऽपि रणे मया भञ्जनं पराभवं प्राप्य मम वशमुपयन्ति । तव भर्ता रामस्तु सदा भङ्गवानिति श्रूयते । परकृतं भङ्गं प्राप्य, भङ्गवानिति ख्यातिमयं लभते । तदसौ कथं मम तुल्यतां प्राप्नोति ?” इति । सीता तु रावणस्येदं वाक्यमनृतं मत्वा, अस्मिन् बिन्दुमात्रमपि श्रवणार्हं नास्तीति निषेधति । गूढमर्थान्तरं तु ‘बिन्दुमात्रमनुस्वार एवात्र न श्रवणार्हः, अनुस्वारं तत्स्थानिकं परसवर्णं च परित्यज्य पुनरिदं पठसि चेत् परिग्राह्यमेव मन्ये’ इति । एवं च निरनुस्वारपाठे कृते —

“निश्चितस्य बुधैर्विपत्त्युपनतावगारदीप्तौजसो  
दुस्साधानपि भजनाद्वशयतः शश्वद्रिपूनाहवे ।  
तुल्यो मे किमु भगवानिति सदा रामः श्रुतो भूसुते”

इति रूपान्तरं जायते, यस्यायमर्थः — “बुधैर्मम विपत्तिर्भविष्यतीति सहेतुकं निश्चितमेव । अहमगारे स्वगृह एव तेजस्वी भवामि ; गृहाद् बहिस्तु परैरभिभूयमानस्य किं, कुत्रत्यं वा तेजः ? गेहेनर्दीति ममैव विशेषणं युज्यते । दुस्साधानपि रिपूनां समराङ्गणे भजनात् प्रसादयामि । अनुनयेन तान्प्रीणयामि, एवं तान्प्रसाद्य वशे करोमि । क्वहमेवं विधः परानुग्रहोपजीवी, कचायं भगवानिति तत्त्ववेदिभिर्वर्ण्यमानः परमपुरुषो रामः ? तत्कथमावयोः साम्यं संभावयितुमपि शक्येत ?” इति । एवं वर्णलोपकृतश्चमत्कारो व्याख्यातः ।

अथ कानिचित्प्रतिदत्ताक्षराणि चित्राणि विमृशेम । इदं तावत्पद्यं दृश्यताम् —

“मारास्योन्नतिभङ्गदायि सुदृशः श्रुत्वा स्वरूपं द्रुतं  
वाञ्छन्त्यस्य जनस्य मण्डनकथां कर्तुं स्वकर्णोत्सवम् ।  
अस्याजिष्वसुरक्षणं परमया शक्त्यैव नैवान्यथा  
मन्दीकुर्वयि मूढ किं बहुमुहुः संजल्पसीत्थं वृथा ॥” (श्लो. 42)

इति । रावणस्य रूपं मारास्योन्नतिभङ्गदायि सौन्दर्यातिशयान्मन्मथस्यापि सुखमालिन्यमापादयतीति भावः । अत एव सुदृशस्तस्य मण्डनकथामलंकारप्रकारं श्रोतुमिच्छन्ति । समरेषु च तस्य प्राणरक्षणं परमया सर्वातिशयिन्या शक्त्यैव । स एकवीरः सर्वानपि

शत्रून् पराभूय विजयोत्सवमाचरतीत्यर्थः । सीता तु तस्य गर्वोक्तिमसहमाना प्रत्याह — “रे मूढ, वृथा मुहुः किं विकल्थसे ? इमं प्रलापं मन्दीकुरु मन्दं कुरु” इति । अस्य प्रतिवचनस्येदमर्थान्तरं भवति — ‘मं मकारं दीकुरु दकारं कुरु’ । मकारस्य स्थाने दकारं पठेत्यर्थः । एवं वर्णादेशे कृते —

“दारास्योन्नतिभङ्गदायि सुदृशः श्रुत्वा स्वरूपं द्रुतं  
वाञ्छन्त्यस्य जनस्य दण्डनकथां कर्तुं स्वकर्णोत्सवम् ।  
अस्याजिष्वसुग्क्ष्णं परदया शक्त्यैव नैवान्यथा”

इति पाठान्तरं भवति । तथा च, ‘अस्य स्वरूपमतीव कुत्सितत्वाद् भयंकरत्वाच्च दाराणां पत्नीनां मुखमालिन्यं जनयति । अत एव सुन्दर्यस्तस्य दण्डनकथां श्रोतुमिच्छन्ति । अयं च समरेषु स्वशक्त्या न, किं तु परेषां दयैव आत्मानं रक्षति । पराक्रमहीनोऽपि उदारेभ्यः शत्रुभ्योऽभयं याचित्वा कथंचिदात्मपरित्राणं करोति’ इति रावणोक्तेस्तात्पर्यं फलति ।

इदमस्य द्वितीयमुदाहरणम् —

“नातिश्लाघ्यगुणस्तव क्षितिसुते भर्ता पितुर्यो गिरा  
नीतिभ्रंशवशाद्विचारविमुखः कान्तारमाशिश्रियत् ।  
स काहं क समस्तयौवतहृदां रूपश्रियानङ्गदो  
न स्थाने भवदुक्तमेतदयि रे पापिष्ठ रक्षोधम ॥” (श्लो. 48)

इति । अत्र रावणः, “हे सीते, तव भर्तुरतिश्लाघ्या गुणा न सन्ति । स हि नीतिमविद्वान् पितुर्वचनं श्रुत्वा राज्यं परित्यज्य वनं जगाम । एतादृशो नीतिभ्रष्टः कः ? क चाहं रूपसंपदा सर्वासां युवतीनामनङ्गदः ? मां दृष्ट्वा सुन्दर्यो रमण्यः व्यामुहयन्ति” इति आत्मानं श्लाघते । सीता तु सक्रोधमाह — ‘राक्षसाधम, भवता यदुक्तं तदेतत् न स्थाने, न उचितम्’ इति । निगूढमर्थान्तरं तु ‘एतदुक्तं तवेदं वचनं नस्थाने नकारस्य स्थाने भवत् भकारसहितं मन्ये’ इति । एवं भकारादेशे कृते —

“भाति श्लाघ्यगुणस्तव क्षितिसुते भर्ता पितुर्यो गिरा  
भातिभ्रंशवशाद्विचारविमुखः कान्तारमाशिश्रियत् ।  
स काहं क समस्तयौवतहृदां रूपश्रिया भङ्गदः”

इति रावणस्य वचसो रूपान्तरं जायते । अस्यार्थः — “हे सीते, तव भर्ता  
 श्लाघ्यैर्गुणैर्युक्तो भाति । को ह्यन्यः पितृनिदेशाद्राज्यं परित्यजेत् ? एष तु महावीरः ,  
 भयहीनत्वादेव किञ्चिदप्यविचार्य वनमाश्रयत् । ईदृशः सर्वगुणोपेतः महापुरुषः क्व ?  
 कचहं रूपश्रिया स्वरूपसंपदा युवतिहृदयानां भङ्गकारी गर्हितवृत्तः ?” इति रावणस्य  
 निन्दायां रामस्य श्लाघायां च पर्यवस्यति ।

तृतीयमुदाहरणमिदं विमृशेम —

“महाकुल इति श्रुतः क इव मद्रदुर्वीसुते  
 सतां श्रुतिविहारिणां मदपदानकीर्तिः सदा ।  
 अनाहतपराक्रमो युधि परैः सदैवास्मि, रे  
 तवोक्तिरपहासदा भवितुमेव सैषार्हति ॥” (श्लो. 55)

इति । सदैवासौत्यन्ताया रावणोक्तेरिदं तात्पर्यम् — “यदहमेव महति कुले संभूतः ।  
 ममापदानानि वीरविलसितानि सतां कर्णेषु विहरन्ति । परे शत्रवः समरे मम पराक्रमं  
 हर्तुं न प्रभवन्ति । एवमसाधारणशक्तिशाली सज्जनश्लाघ्यचरितोऽहं महाकुलप्रसूतस्त्वया  
 स्वीकार्यः” इति । सीता तु तस्येमां गवोक्तिं श्रुत्वा परिहसति — “तवैषा उक्तिरपहा-  
 सदा भवितुमेवार्हति । ईदृशमश्रद्धेयं साहंकारं वचः श्रुत्वा तत्त्वविदो हसेयुः” इति ।  
 अपहासदेत्यत्र पदभङ्गेनार्थान्तरं बुध्यते — “एषा तवोक्तिः अपहा लुप्तहकारा सदा  
 दकारसहिता चैव भवितुमर्हति । हकारस्थाने दकारादेशं कृत्वा पुनरपीदमेव पठ”  
 इति । एवमादेशे कृते,

“महाकुल इति श्रुतः क इव मद्रदुर्वीसुते  
 सतां श्रुतिविदारिणी मदपदानकीर्तिः सदा ।  
 अनाहतपराक्रमो युधि परैः सदैवास्मि”

इति पाठान्तरं संपद्यते । अस्य च भावः, “अहमेव मद्यपायी मदाकुलो भवामि ।  
 न कश्चिदन्यः मद्रत् मदाकुलः श्रूयते । ममापदानानां क्रूरचेष्टितानां कीर्तिः सतां  
 कर्णान् विदारयति ; लोकपीडाकराणि मम कर्माणि श्रुत्वैव सन्त उद्विजन्ते । युद्धे च  
 शत्रवः मम पराक्रमं कदापि नाद्रियन्ते — ममाल्पशक्तित्वात् शत्रवो मां सदा  
 तस्कुर्वन्ति” इति निष्पद्यते ।

अथ अधिदत्ताक्षरं चित्रमवलोकयेम । इदमेकमुदाहरणम् —

“इतित्यङ्गिनजबन्धुपौरपरिषत्तोष्ट्रयमनोऽस्म्यहम्  
शान्तातङ्कनिमित्तभूतचरितः सीतेऽस्म्यहं पश्य माम् ।  
नित्यं किं च धनोपलब्ध्यनुगुणव्यापार एवास्मि, रे  
स्वैरं जल्प मुहुर्निकारविषयाः प्रागेव तेऽमी गुणाः ॥” (श्लो. 40)

इति । एवास्मीत्यन्तं रावणस्य वचनम् । “अहं तावत् इति बाधां त्यजन्तीति  
इतित्यजः सर्वप्रकारसंकटरहिता बन्धवः पौराश्च, तेषां परिषदा स्तूयमानोऽस्मि ।  
इतयः षड्विधा इति प्रसिद्धाः । तासां परिहारेण सौख्यं जनयतो मम बन्धवः  
पौराश्च कृतज्ञतया मां पुनः पुनः स्तुवन्तीत्यर्थः । आतङ्कनिमित्तभूतानि मम चरितानि  
शान्तानि ; निवृत्तपापोऽं मङ्गलेषु कार्येष्वेव प्रवर्ते । महतो राज्यस्य रक्षकोऽहं  
धनार्जने दत्तचित्तोऽस्मि” इति रावणः स्वगुणानाविष्करोति । सीतात्वाह — “यथेष्टं  
कथस्व ते गुणाः निकारस्य तिरस्कारस्य विषया इति पूर्वमेव विदिताः” इति ।  
गूढोऽभिप्रायस्तु — ‘प्रागेव विशेषणानामादावेव निकारविषयाः ‘नि’शब्दयुक्तास्तवगुणा  
इति मन्ये’ इति । एवं निशब्दे पूर्व संयोजिते सति

“नीतित्यङ्गिनजबन्धुपौरपरिषत्तोष्ट्रयमनोऽस्म्यहं  
निशान्तातङ्कनिमित्तभूतचरितः सीतेऽस्म्यहं पश्य माम् ।  
नित्यं किं च निधनोपलब्ध्यनुगुणव्यापार एवास्मि”

इति रावणोक्तिरन्यथा पर्यवस्यति । तथा च, “नीतिहीनाः बन्धवः पौराश्च मां पुनः  
पुनः स्तुवन्ति । स्वयं दुर्मागर्गामितया दुराचारं मां ते श्लाघन्ते । मम च चरितानि  
निशान्तस्य अन्तःपुरस्य (मन्दोदरीप्रमुखानां भार्याणामिति यावत्) आतङ्कनिमित्तानि  
भवन्ति । मम दुराचारं दृष्ट्वा ता भाविनमनर्थं संभावयन्त्यः शोचन्ति । नित्यं चाहं  
निधनस्य मरणस्योपलब्ध्यावनुगुणं व्यापारं करोमि । प्रबलस्य शत्रो रामस्य विरोधं संपाद्य  
मरणमेव वृणे” इत्यर्थः फलति ।

द्वितीयं पद्यमेतत्परीक्षेमहि —

“आशाहर्षितसम्पदर्यभिमुखव्यक्ती भवत्पौरुषः  
सीतेऽहं वनवारिजावमतिभृद्वक्त्रावलिः मङ्गरे ।

न श्रूये किमशोचितस्वजनतापर्यावृतश्च त्वया

रे मूर्खासि यथोदिताखिलगुणः प्रागेव नीच श्रुतः ॥” (श्लो. 52)

इति । अत्र तृतीयपादान्तरस्य रावणवचसः, “मम तावदाशार्हाः सद्भिरेषणीयाः सर्वाः संपदः सन्ति । अरीणां सन्निधौ मम पौरुषं पराक्रमोऽपि व्यक्तं भवति । अत एव युद्धे मम वक्त्रावलिर्हर्षजन्यं विकासं प्राप्ता वनवारिजानां जलकमलानां [कमलानामम्लानत्वं द्यातयितुं जले स्थितानामिति विशेषणमुपात्तम् । वनं जलम् । वने सलिलकानने इति कोशः] अवमानं संपादयति । मम जनता च सर्वातिशायिनो रक्षकस्य लाभादशोचिता विलमति” इति तात्पर्यं स्पष्टम् । सीता तु, “रे मूर्ख, नीच, यथा वदमि तथा प्रागेव श्रुतोऽसि, अतः, अद्य स्वैरं मा भाषिष्ठाः” इति प्रत्याह । द्वितीयो गूढार्थस्तु — ‘प्रागेव विशेषणानामादावेव नी [नकारोऽस्यास्तीति नी । नत्वर्थीय इतिः ।] नकारसहितश्च त्वं श्रुतः’ इति । एवं च विशेषणानामादौ नकारे योजिते, एषैव रावणोक्तिः —

“नाशार्हाखिलसम्पत् नार्यभिमुखव्यक्ती भवत्पौरुषः

सीतेऽहं नवनवारिजावमतिभृद्वक्त्रावलिः सङ्गरे ।

न श्रूये किं नाशोचितं स्वजनतापर्यावृतश्च त्वया”

इति रूपान्तरमाप्नोति । “मम सर्वाः संपदः पापफलत्वात् नाशमर्हन्ति । मम पौरुषं वीराणां पुरः प्रणश्यति । नारीणामग्रे एव व्यक्तं भवति । सङ्गरे च मम वक्त्रावलिः नवनवाः अरिजाः अवमतीः विभर्ति ; शत्रवो मां पुनः पुनः परिभवन्ति । पौरुष-हीनत्वात्तान्परिभवानहं सहे । मम जनता पापपरायणत्वात् नाशोचिता ; अहमिव मम सर्वाऽपि परिवारः, महापातककारित्वात् मृत्युदण्डमेवार्हति” इति च तात्पर्यमावेद्यते ।

एवं पञ्चाशत् पद्यानि श्लिष्टार्थप्रत्युक्तिगर्भाणि विरचय्य, अन्ते ग्रन्थकारः स्पष्टैकार्थप्रतिवचनानि वर्णलोपजनित चमत्काराणि नव पद्यानि ग्रथ्नाति । तेषु ‘रामायातिपदुत्वमेव’त्यादिः श्लोकः पूर्वमेवोदाहृतः, यत्र प्रथमस्य रावणस्य लोपादर्थान्तरं निष्पद्यते । इदं तावत् पद्यं द्वितीयवर्णलोपे उदाह्रियते —

“अर्ताव गुणवान् पुमान् क इह मद्बुद्धीसुते

शशीव ममवेक्षणाद् हृदि कृतप्रहर्षस्मिहम् ।

महारणमहोत्सवार्थहमिवापरः कः पुमान्

पुनश्च खल तद्वचो वद विना द्वितीयाक्षरम् ॥” (श्लो. 68)

इति । “अहमेवात्यन्तं गुणवान् ; चन्द्र इवाहमपि लोकानामालोकनमात्रेण हर्षमाद-  
धामि । वीरत्वादहं महारणं महोत्सवं मन्ये, तमेव चाभ्यर्थये” इति रावणः कथ्यते ।  
सीता तु तत्र द्वितीयं वर्णं त्यजेति लोपं विधत्ते । लुप्ते च द्वितीयाक्षरे —

“अवगुणवान् पुमान् क इह मद्रदुर्वीसुते

शवसमवेक्षणाद् हृदि कृतप्रहर्षाऽस्म्यहम् ।

मरणमहोत्सवार्थहमिवापरः कः पुमान्”

इति श्लोकस्य रूपं परिवर्तने । “अहमेव अवगुणानां निधिरस्मि ; शवभक्षण-  
शीलत्वात् शवं वीक्ष्य महान्तं हर्षं लभे ; रामेण युद्धं कृत्वा मरिष्यामीति जानन्नेव  
मरणार्थी त्वां तस्मै न समर्पयामि” इति चास्य तात्पर्यं स्पष्टमवगम्यते ।

इदं चतुर्थाक्षरलोपस्योदाहरणं दृश्यताम् —

“मद्वत्पावनशीलतामुपगतः कोप्यस्ति नोर्वीसुते

श्रेयो लोकपवन्ममेति कलये त्वत्प्राप्तिः साम्प्रतम् ।

क्षिप्रं प्रेरित एव तेऽभिमतसंसिद्धिं विदध्यामहं

त्रिष्वप्यङ्घ्रिषु तुर्यवर्णरहितं रे जल्प ते जल्पितम् ॥” (श्लो. 70)

इति । अत्र रावणः, “अहं पावनशीलः, लोकपानां [लोकं पान्तीति लोकपाः  
इन्द्रादयो लोकपालाः] इव ममापि श्रेयो वर्धते त्वया प्रेरितस्तव सर्वमभीष्टं संपादयामि”  
इत्याह । चतुर्थवर्णे लुप्ते, पावनशीलः पानशीलो भवति । अस्य च श्रेयः,  
लोपवत् विनाशोन्मुखं जायते । प्रेतो भूत्वैव एष सीताया इष्टं पूरयितुमलं भवति ।  
एवं वर्णलोपादर्थान्तरं कविश्चातुर्येण दर्शयति ।

इदमस्य कवेः पाण्डित्यं यदसौ, उदाहरिष्यमाणे श्लोके षष्ठस्य सप्तमस्य वा वर्णस्य  
लोपं विधाय, उभयथापि अर्थान्तरं प्रतिपादयति —

“रामः सीते विकलसदभिप्रीतिभारो भवत्यां

युध्युद्द्रावप्रहसिततमानेव कुर्यात्स वीरान् ।

नाथस्तेऽसावननुगुण इत्येव जानीहि नूनं  
षष्ठं वर्णं विजहदथवा सप्तमं जल्प पापिन् ॥” (श्लो. 73)

इति । अत्र रावणः, “हे सीते, रामस्य भवत्यां प्रीतिर्नास्ति ; स विकलसदभि-  
प्रीतिभारः । प्रेमाभावात् त्वां पुनः प्राप्तुमपि न यतते । अथ मया सह युध्येत, तर्हि  
मम वीरानवलोक्यैव भयात्पलायमानः, उद्द्रावेण (पलायनेन) तान् प्रहासयेत् ।  
तस्मादयं रामस्ते नानुगुणः पतिरित्येवेहि । तं परित्यज्य मां भज” इति वदति ।  
सीता तु षष्ठं सप्तमं वा वर्णं विहाय, इदमेव वाक्यं पुनर्वादेति द्वयोरेकस्य लोपं विधत्ते ।  
षष्ठवर्णलोपे —

“रामः सीते विलसदभिप्रीतिभारो भवत्यां  
युध्युद्द्रावप्रसिततमानेव कुर्यात्स वीरान् ।  
नाथस्तेऽसावननुगुण इत्येव जानीहि नूनम्”

इति पाठान्तरं लभामहे । विलसदभिप्रीतिभार इत्यनेन सीतायां रामस्य प्रीतिरचला  
विलसतीति निश्चीयते । ‘अनन्या हि मया सीता भास्करेण प्रभा यथे’ति रामायणे  
रामः सीताया आत्मनश्च सम्बन्धमभेद्यं घोषयति । रावणस्य वीराश्च युधि रामपराक्रमाद्  
भीताः, उद्द्रावे (पलायने) प्रसितास्तत्परा एव भवेयुः । ‘तत्परे प्रसितासक्तौ’  
इत्यमरः । असौ नाथः सीताया अनुगुणः, प्रेमपूर्णत्वात् महावीरत्वाच्च । इत्थमर्थ-  
सामञ्जस्यं स्पष्टम् ।

सप्तमवर्णलोपेऽपि —

“रामः सीते विकसदभिप्रीतिभारो भवत्यां  
युध्युद्द्रावप्रहततमानेव कुर्यात्स वीरान् ।  
नाथस्तेऽसावननुगुण इत्येव जानीहि नूनम्”

इति वाक्यान्तरमुपजायते । तस्य चायमर्थः — “हे सीते, त्वयि रामस्य प्रीतिभारो  
विकसति, वर्धते । स युद्धे मम वीरानुद्गैः, तन्नामकैर्त्राणविशेषैः [‘उद्रः पन्नगभेदे च  
यादो भेदेषु भेदयोः’ इति निघण्टुसारः ।] अतिशयेन अवप्रहतान् कुर्यात् ; वीरान्  
हन्यादिति यावत् । स ते भर्ता अनगुणः [न अगुणः] गुणशाली एव । [द्वौ हि  
प्रतिषेधौ विधेयमर्थं द्रढयतः ।] तस्मात्तमेव भजस्व” इति । एवमेकस्मिन् पद्ये  
दुष्करं वर्णलोपविकल्पं कृत्वा ग्रन्थकारः असाधारणं पाण्डित्यं निरूपयति ।

एवमेकोनां षष्टि पद्यानां रचयित्वा परिश्रान्तोऽयं कविः, प्रतिज्ञातस्य श्लोकशतकस्य पूरणमन्यः कोऽपि करोतु इति प्रार्थयामास । किंतु अद्यापि न केनापि ईदृशान् श्लोकान्निर्माय ग्रन्थकारस्य प्रतिज्ञा सार्थक्यमापादिता । दुष्कराणि खल्विमानि चित्राणि । अन्ते च रावणवधः, रामस्य पट्टाभिषेकश्च कविना वर्णितो दृश्यते । ग्रन्थकारः स्वयमस्य ग्रन्थस्य टीकामपि व्यधात् । टीकाया अन्ते, स एवमाह —

“अव्याजादतिवत्सला मयि, ममाध्यास्याननं या स्वयं  
सीतारावणवादझर्यभिधया ख्यातां कृतिं दुर्घटाम् ।  
संग्रथ्यातिमुदा तदर्थविवृतिं चैवं व्यधात्तुष्टये  
सीतारावणयोर्नमामि शिरसा वाग्देवतामेव ताम् ॥”

इति । वाग्देवताया अनुग्रहेणैव एतादृशोऽतिदुष्करः चमत्कारपूर्णः ग्रन्थः श्रीराम-  
शास्त्रिणा ग्रथ्यतेति वयमपि विश्वसिमः ।

अयं ग्रन्थः १९०५ तमे क्रिस्ताब्दे राजकीयमुद्राक्षरशालायां (Govt. Branch Press) मैसूरनगरे मुद्रितः, स्वयं ग्रन्थगुणपरीक्षासन्तुष्टेन मैसूरनगरस्थराजकीय-  
प्राच्यकोशागाराध्यक्षेण (Curator, Govt. Oriental Library, Mysore.) महादेवशास्त्रिणा प्रकाशितश्चेति भूमिकायामुल्लिखितं पश्यामः । अस्य विद्वन्मानस-  
रञ्जनक्षमस्य ग्रन्थस्य भूयान् प्रचारो भूयादिति भगवन्तमभ्यर्थये ॥







पक्षधरापराभिधो जयदेवः एतद्व्याख्यायाः सन्दर्भमुद्धरति । नैयायिकस्य प्रभाकरस्य च कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यासीत् । इदानीं सा नोपलभ्यते । शङ्करमिश्रः स्वकीये कुसुमाञ्जल्यामोदे प्रोक्तमकरन्देन सहास्याः परिमलव्याख्यायाः अपि उल्लेखं करोति । परमधुनायं परिमलो नैव मिलति । दिवाकरोपाध्यायः परिमलव्याख्यातासीदित्यैतिहासिकाः । वासुदेवसार्वभौमकृतानुमानमणिपरीक्षायां रुचिदत्तस्य प्रसिद्धे मकरन्दे चैतत् सन्दर्भः समुद्धृतोऽस्ति गुर्जरदेशीयपत्तनभण्डारस्य मातृकाविवरणे दिवाकररचित-कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यायाः परिमलाभिधायाः खण्डितोऽशश्चर्चितः ।

कुसुमाञ्जलेरुपलब्धव्याख्याग्रन्थेषु वरदराजस्य (खृ. ११८५) बोधिनी सर्वप्राथम्यं भजते । बोधिन्या आदितस्त्रयः स्तवकाः सरस्वतीभवनग्रन्थमालायां प्रकाशं गताः । अवशिष्टांशस्य मातृका आधारपुस्तकागारे सुरक्षितास्ति । उदयनस्याभिप्रायावबोधे ग्रन्थोऽयं महानुपयोगी विद्यते । वर्धमानस्य (१२५०) कुसुमाञ्जलिप्रकाशस्तु सर्वतोऽधिकं विद्वत्सु प्रचलितः । ग्रन्थेऽस्मिन् पाण्डित्यस्याधिकं परिपाकः परिलक्ष्यते । वर्धमानस्तु नव्यन्यायस्य शैलीमनुसृत्येमां व्याख्यां व्यलिखदिति । अस्यां च व्याख्यायां स्वपितुः गङ्गेशोपाध्यायस्य ग्रन्थसन्दर्भाः यत्रतत्र समुद्धृताः वर्धमानेन । भगीरथठक्कुरस्तु अस्य प्रकाशस्योपरि टीकां विरचयामास । अस्थैवापराभिधानं मेघ इति । तस्मादस्य ग्रन्थः मेघनाम्ना तत्पर्यायभूत जलदनाम्ना च प्रसिद्धोऽस्ति । चौखम्बासंस्कृतग्रन्थमालायां अस्याः प्रकाशनमभवत् । प्रकाशोपरि अपरोपव्याख्या रुचिदत्तकृतः मकरन्दोऽस्ति । तत् एवास्यापि मुद्रणमभवत् । शङ्करमिश्रस्य कुसुमाञ्जल्यामोदः पश्चाद्भवासु व्याख्यासु विशिष्टं स्थानमधिकरोति । कलिकाताविश्वविद्यालयस्य आशुतोषग्रन्थमालायामस्यामोदस्य प्रकाशनं संजातम् । मैथिलेतराचार्येषु गुणानन्दविद्यावागीशस्य कुसुमाञ्जलितात्पर्यविवेकः विशेषेणोल्लेखमर्हति । आमोदेन सहैवायमपि प्रकाशितः । अद्यत्वेऽपि मूलग्रन्थस्याध्ययनमध्यापनं प्रचारश्चैधन्त । सर्वतन्त्रस्वतन्त्रो धर्मदत्तज्ञा (वच्चाज्ञा) महाशयः कुसुमाञ्जलौ टिप्पणीं व्यरचयत् । दाक्षिणात्यविदुषः वीरराघवस्य कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्या मदुक्तेरुपोद्बलिता । संप्रत्यपि कलिकातायां पण्डिततारानाथतर्कतीर्थः सतीन्द्रनाथ तर्कतीर्थश्च कुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यानपरावास्तामिति श्रूयते । कुसुमाञ्जलेः प्रचारप्रसारौ विभिन्नास्वाधुनिकभाषासु भवतः । काशिराजपण्डितः श्यामाकान्ततर्कपञ्चाननः वरदराजकृतटीकामालम्ब्य षड्भाषायां कुसुमाञ्जलेरनुवादं विदधाति स्म । रवितीर्थश्च आंग्लभाषायामेतमनुद्याधार-

पुस्तकागारस्य शोधपत्रिकायां प्रकाशितवान् । वाराणसेयसंस्कृतविश्वविद्यालयस्य प्राध्यापकः पण्डितदुर्गाधरझा महाशयः हिन्दीभाषायां कुसुमाञ्जलिमनूद्य मुद्रणार्थं प्रस्तुतवान् ।

केवलं कारिकाभागमादाय व्याख्यातृषु हरिदासभट्टाचार्यः सर्वोच्चमास्पदं गृह्णाति । एतस्य व्याख्यायाष्टीका कामाख्यानाथतर्कगणीशेन कृताया मुद्रितास्ति । चन्द्रकान्तस्याप्युपव्याख्या प्रकाशिता विद्यते । हरिदासकृतव्याख्यायाः प्रचारः प्रायः सर्वत्र भारतस्य प्रत्येकस्मिन्प्रान्ते तद्ब्रह्मिर्भूतदेशेष्वप्यस्ति । आंग्लभाषायामस्यानुवादं ई.वी. कावेल महाशयः पारेखमहाशयश्च कृतवानिति विदितं विदुषाम् । आचार्य विश्वेश्वरोऽस्य हिन्द्यामनुवादं विधाय चौखम्बाप्रकाशनतः मुद्रितवान् । म.म. रामकृष्णतर्कतीर्थेनास्य मर्मार्थः कुसुमाञ्जलिसौरभे सद्मुघाटितः । एकस्मिन् समये रामभद्रकृतास्य व्याख्या वङ्गदेशेऽधिकां प्रसिद्धिं भजते स्म । आशुतोषग्रन्थमालायामेषापि मुद्रिता रघुदेवन्याया-लङ्कारोऽप्य मुंव्याख्याति स्म । जम्बूनगरस्य मातृकाभवने सरस्वतीभवने च सा व्याख्या सुक्षिता विद्यते ।

रुद्रन्यायवाचस्पतिकृतास्य व्याख्या सरस्वतीभवने मातृकायामुपलभ्यते । जयरामन्यायपञ्चाननकृतायाः व्याख्यायाः पाण्डुलिपिः काश्यां तंजोरनगरे च मिलति । वासुदेवसार्वभौमकृता कुसुमाञ्जलेर्व्याख्या कस्मिंश्चित्काले नितरां प्रसिद्धासीत् । डा० भिनिश महाशयः स्वस्य मातृकाविवरणे शिरोमणिकृतकुसुमाञ्जलिव्याख्यायाश्चर्चां विधत्ते । डा० कीलहौर्नमहाशयः गदाधरभट्टाचार्यकृतां व्याख्यामपि समुल्लिखति । चन्द्रनारायणन्यायपञ्चाननस्य कुसुमाञ्जलिकारिकाव्याख्याः मातृका मिरजापुरनगरे(उत्तर-प्रदेशे) अस्तीति श्रूयते । शिवचन्द्रसार्वभौमस्य कुसुमाञ्जलिटीकायाः अंशविशेषः विद्योदयपत्रिकायां प्रकाशितोऽभवदिति ।

गङ्गेशोपाध्यायस्पेश्वरानुमानचिन्तामणानुदयनाचार्यस्त्वेश्वरवादविषयिण्यो युक्तयः सर्वथा नूतनं रूपं धारयित्वाविर्बभूवुः । किन्तु प्रचलनमस्य चिन्तामणेरन्यभागमपेक्ष्य नितरां सोमितमासीत् । वाराणसीनरेशसभापण्डिनेन जयनारायणतर्कपञ्चाननेन तर्क-रत्नावलीनाम्नि स्वतन्त्रे गन्थे ईश्वरसाधकयुक्तीनां संग्रहोऽकारि ॥



## दण्डिकथा\*

कस्मिंश्चिद् देशे दण्डीत्यभिहितो ब्राह्मणः कश्चित् प्रतिवसति स्म । [स] नितरां दीनोऽशनेन हीनो [बभूव] । [स च] वसनैर् [अपि] हीनो बभूव । तेन कस्माच्चिद् गृहपतेर्वृषः कश्चिद् धारितः । दिवाभागे स वृषभं कर्मणि नियोज्य पश्चात् तमादाय च तस्य गृहपतेर्गृहं जगाम ।

तत्र [गृहे] गृहपतिर्हि भोज्यं बुभुजे । दण्डिना स च वृषो भवनस्य [अजिर-] मध्ये त्यक्तः । ऋषभं द्वारान्तरं क्रान्त्वा नष्टो बभूव । स गृहपतिरपि भुक्त्वा तद् भोज्यमुत्तस्थौ । तत्र [गृहचत्वरे] च वृषं नावलोक्य तेन [गृहपतिना] “वृषभः कास्ती”ति दण्डी पप्रच्छे ।

तेन [दण्डिना] [प्रत्य्-] उक्तम् — “तव गृहे मुक्तः” [इति] ।

[गृहपतिः पुनर्] उवाच — “त्वया मे पुंगवो यतस्त्यक्तः [अतस्तं त्वं मे] प्रत्यर्पये”ति ।

तेन [दण्डिना] उत्तरितम् — “न मया [वृषो] नाशितः” इति ।

ततस्तौ सहितौ “राज्ञः सकाशं गच्छाव । [स राजा] आवयोन्याय्यत्वम् अन्याय्यत्वं च विचारयिष्यती” त्युक्त्वा जन्तुश्च ।

[तदा] कस्यचिज् जनान्तरस्य काचिदश्वा [छित्रग्रन्धना सर्ता] पलायितवती । तेन [जनान्तरेण] दण्डी [“क्व ममाश्वे”ति] पृष्टः ।

[दण्डी प्रत्य्-] उवाच — “न [मया वृषवत्] तुरङ्गमाऽपि बन्धनान् नोचिने”ति ।

[ततस्] तेन [दण्डिना अश्वागतिरोधार्यं] उपलः कश्चिज् जगृहे अश्वां [प्रति] निचिक्षिपे च [;] [स चोपलः] अश्वायाः पदमेकमाहत्य [तद्] बभञ्ज ।

तेन [जनेन] जगदे — “यतस्त्वया तुरगा मम मारिताऽतः प्रतिदेहि [मे] ममाऽश्वाम्” [इति] ।

[दण्डिनोक्तम् —] “कस्य हेतोरश्वां दास्यामि ?” [इति] ।

[जनेन] तेनाऽऽकारितम् — “इहागच्छ । नृपस्य सविधे च व्रजाव । [स] आवयोर्विचारनिष्पत्तिं करिष्यती”ति ।

तदा तौ जग्मतुश्च ।

[ततो वैरिभयात्] स दण्डी पलायितुमारेभे । [अपसरणावसरे] स च कस्यचित् कुड्यस्याधस्ताद् अवपुप्लुवे । तस्य पुरतस्तन्तुवायः कश्चित् तन्तून् संवाया-  
सानः । तस्य [कुविन्दस्य] उपरिष्ठात् [दण्डी] पपात । स च तन्तुवायः कालगतः ।  
[ततस्] तन्तुवायस्य भार्यया स दण्डी [करे] दध्रे ।

[सा] उवाच — “यतस्त्वया मम भर्ता निहतः [अतः] प्रतियच्छ मे भर्तारम्”  
इति ।

[दण्डी प्रत्य्-] उवाच — “कथं ते स्वामी मया प्रतिदायिष्यते ?” इति ।

[सोवाच-] “इत एहि [;] राज्ञः सन्निधिं गच्छाव । तेनावयोर्विचारो  
निष्पादयिष्यत” इति [। ततस्तौ] जग्मतुः ।

[तेषां गमन-]मार्गस्य मध्ये काचिद् गम्भीरा नदी बभूव । सलिलस्य तस्य  
सम्मुख[तटे] सूत्रधरः कश्चिन् मुखेन कुठारमुद्रहन्नागतः । पप्रच्छे स च दण्डिना —  
“कियज् जलस्य गाम्भीर्यम्” इति ।

“गम्भीरताऽस्ति नीरस्ये”ति कथनेन [सूत्रधरस्य] कुठारो जले पपात । [तक्षा]  
परशुं च न प्राप । तेन [तक्षणा] दण्डी [हस्ते] जगृहे ।

[सूत्रधरेणाधिक्षिप्तो दण्डी —] “त्वया मे परश्वधः पयसि पातितः” [इति] ।

तेन [दण्डिना प्रत्य् -] ऊचे - “न [मयाऽयम्] अस्तः” [इति] ।

“इहाऽऽयाहि [;] नृपतेः सकाशं च प्रसराव । तेनाऽऽवयोर्निर्णयो विधास्यत”  
इति वदित्वा [तौ] जग्मतुः ।

[ततस्] ते [सर्वे] गत्वा च नरपतेः सन्निधिं प्रापुः । ते भूभृतश्चरणे शिरसा  
प्रणमुः [;] एकपाश्वरे [च] निषेदुः ।

ततश्च भूपतिना ते पप्रच्छिरे - “किमर्थं यूयमागताः” इति ।

[तदा] तैः सर्वैर्दण्डिगृहपत्योर्विवादो [राज्ञे] विवृतः ।

[तद् विवरणमाकर्ण्य] भूपेन दण्डी वभाषे - “किं त्वया वृषो धारितः ?” इति ।

[दण्डी गिरमाददे -] “अथ किम्” [इति] ।

[राजोवाच -] “यावत् प्रतियच्छ [वृषभम्] । [तथा] प्रतिदेहि यथा गृह-  
पतिना [पुंगवः प्रत्यर्णकाले] दृश्यते” [इति] ।

[दण्ड्युवाच -] “ससम्बोधनं हि न [वृषो गृहपतये प्रति-]दत्तः” [इति] ।

नराधिपेनोद्धोषितम् - “यतोऽमुना दण्डिनाऽऽभाषणमन्तरेण वृषभः प्रतिददे  
[अतोऽस्य] रसनां छिन्धि । यतो हि गृहस्वामी वृषमागच्छन्तं पश्यन्नपि न बन्ध  
[अतोऽस्य] नयनम् [एकम्] उत्पाटये”ति ।

गृहपतिनोचे - “प्रथमतो मम वृषो दण्डिना नाशितः । द्वितीयतो मम  
नयनापनयनं यतो वरमतो [विवादे] दण्ड्येव जया भवतु” [इति] ।

जनेन केनचित् [तुरङ्गमास्वामिना] ऊचे - “देव दण्डिना ममाश्वा मारिते”ति ।

नृपेण दण्डी पप्रच्छे - “कथं त्वयाश्वा निहते”ति ।

[दण्डी चक्षे -] “यदाहं पथा गन्तुमारब्धवांस्तदा [तुङ्गमा] समागता ।  
जनेनाऽनेनाऽश्वा [बन्धनान्] न मोचितेति [सा स्वयमुच्छिन्नबन्धना] तदा प्राप्ता ।  
[तस्या जवनिरोधार्थं] मयाऽश्मा कश्चिदात्तः । [ग्रावाणं तं] निरस्याश्वा [सा मया]  
निहता” इति ।

नरपतिनोचे - “अश्वपतिनाऽश्वा [बन्धनान्] न मोचितेति हेतोरस्य रसनां  
छिन्धि । दण्डिनोपलो निचिक्षिप इति बाहुम् [अस्यैकं] कृन्धि” [इति] ।



जनेन तेन [सतिपतिना] प्रोक्तम् — “प्रथमतो मम घोटकी हता । द्वितीयतो यतो जिह्वा मे छेत्स्यते वरमतो दण्डयेव जयी भवतु” [इति] ।

[ततस्] तन्तुवायस्य भार्यया बभाषे — “भर्ता मे दण्डिना हतः” [इति] ।

दण्डिना [नृपाय] निवेदितम् — “वर्धिता मम शत्रव इति भीतः [सन्नहं] प्राचीरादवप्लुत्य पलायितवान् । [तेन च] अन्तराले आसीनोऽदृष्टो जनः [कुविन्दो] निहतः” [इति] ।

नरपतिनोचे — “[तद्] गच्छ, [दण्डिन्,] अस्या एव भर्ता भव” [इति] ।

तया [तन्तुवायजायया] जगदे — “प्रथमतो मे स्वामी मृतः । द्वितीयतो यतोऽयं [वैधेयो] धवो [मम] भविष्यति वरमतो दण्डयेव जयी भवतु [निर्णये]” इति ।

[ततः] सूत्रधरेणोदीरितम् — “यतोऽयं दण्डी मां पृष्टवान् ‘कियज् जलस्य गाम्भीर्यमि’ति [अतो मम] मुखाद् विधृतः कुठारो नीरे पतितः” [इति] ।

भूपेन भणितम् — “यत् किञ्चिदपि हार्यं वस्तु स्कन्धे वहनस्य योग्यमिति हेतोर् [अनेन] यत आनने [परशुर्] ऊढः [अतः] पूर्वम् [अस्य] सूत्रधरस्य दन्तद्वयं भङ्ग्धि । ‘किम् [अस्त्य्] अम्भसो गाम्भीर्यमि’ति यतः [पप्रच्छे] दण्डी [अतोऽस्य] जिह्वां छिन्धि” [इति] ।

[तदा] सूत्रधरेणोक्तम् — “प्रथमतो मम परशुर्नष्टः । द्वितीयतो मम रदन-भञ्जनं यतस्ततो वरं जयतु दण्डी” [इति] ।

[एवं] ते सर्वे [स्वस्वोचितां] पृथग् विचारनिष्पत्तिं चाक्रिरे । दण्डी [च] सर्वापरा-धेभ्यो मुमुचे इति ॥

## వక్రతాసిద్ధాంతము - భామహాడు

భామహాచార్యుడు తన గ్రంథమున 'వక్రత' యన్నమాటను నాలెదుబోట్ల వాడెను.

1. న నితాంతాదిమాత్రేణ జాయతే చారుతా గిరామ్  
వక్రాభిదేయశబ్దోక్తి రిష్టావాచా మలంకృతిః. 1.36
2. (a) నైషా నరైవ వక్రోక్తి రనయాద్ధో విభావ్యతే  
యతోఽస్యాం కవినా కార్యః కోఽలంకారోఽనయా వినా. 2.85
- (b) హేతుశ్చ సూక్ష్మే తేశోఽథ నాలంకారతయా మతః  
సముదాయాభిధానస్య వక్రోక్త్యనభిధానతః. 2.86
3. "—వాచాం వక్తార్థ శబ్దోక్తి రలంకారాయ కల్పితే." 5.68
4. వక్రవాచాం కవీనాం యే ప్రయోగం ప్రతి పాధవః  
ప్రయోక్తుం యే న యుక్తాశ్చ తద్వివేకోఽయ ముచ్యతే. 6.23

వీనిననుసరించి భామహాని దృష్టిలో వక్రతయననేమో నిశ్చయింపబడవలెను. అతడెచ్చటను వక్రతాశబ్దమునన్వయములుమున స్పష్టముగా 'దీనియర్థమిది' యని నిశ్చయింపలేడు కావున,

పైశ్లోకములేనందర్పమున — ఏ విషయచర్చానందర్పమున వ్రాయబడినది ?  
అచట ప్రయోగింపబడిన 'వక్రత' యన్నమాటకర్తమేమి ?

మొదటి శ్లోకము గ్రహింప బడుచున్నది.

## I ప్రబంధ వక్రత

అఖ్యాయికా, కథా, నిబద్ధాది కావ్యభేద వివరణమున ఆచార్యుడు వైదర్భ్య, గౌడీయ కావ్యవిషయమునుగూర్చి నాల్గమాటలు వ్రాసెను.

“కొందఱు వైదర్భనామక కావ్యమే గొప్పది. ఇతరమైనది అర్హసంపన్నమైనను కాదందురు. గౌడీయమని, వైదర్భమని పేర్కొని వివాదపడుట స్వార్థము. అది అమేధుల పని. — అపుష్టార్థమై, అఃక్రోధి కమై, ప్రసన్నఋజుకోమలమై గేయమువలె శ్రుతిపేళలమైనది ఏ కావ్యమైనను చ్యాజ్యమే. అగ్రామ్యార్థజోభితమై, సాలంకారమై, న్యాయోపేతమై, అనాకులమైన కావ్యము గౌడీయమైనను గ్రాహ్యమే.”

(1.31—35)

ఇట్లు వ్రాసి ‘స నితాంతాది’ శ్లోకము వ్రాసెను.

వైదర్భ్య గౌడీయములను కావ్యభేదములుగనే పరిగణించినాడు కాని రీతిభేదములనలేదు. రీతి శబ్దమునాటికిచెదు. రీతి — మార్గము — వర్తమా — ఇట్టివి తర్వాతివారు వాడిన మాటలు.

భామహునినాటికి శ్రుతిపేళలములై గేయములవంటివానిని (పాదుకొనుటకు, చదువుకొనుటకు వీలైనవి — గంధీరార్థ సంపన్నములుకానివి) వైదర్భకావ్యములనియు వ్యతిరేక్తములైనవి గౌడీయములనియు పేర్లు పెట్టి వ్యవహరించుచుండిరి. అశ్మకవంశాది కావ్యములు వైదర్భములట. ఈ పేర్లెందుకు పెట్టిరి ?

‘కామం తథాస్త్ర ప్రామేణ సంజ్ఞేచ్ఛాతో విధీయతే.’

1.33

ఎవని యిష్టము వానిది. వానికి తోచినపేరు వాడు పెట్టెను. అందర్థమేమున్నది ?

కావున మృదువుగానున్నవి వైదర్భములు, కఠినములు గౌడీయములు. కేవల శ్రుతిపేళలములైనవాని నాదరించుట, కఠినములను నిరాదరించుట అవివేకము. అవిచారమూలము. కావ్యస్వసిద్ధికి శబ్దమాదుర్య కాఠిన్యదులు హేతువులుకావు. మఱి వక్రశబ్దము — వక్రార్థము—వక్రత. ‘శబ్దార్థో సహితో కావ్యః’ అన్నమాటయందు విశ్వాసమున్న భామహుడు శబ్దార్థోభయగతముగా వక్రతయుండవలెననుచున్నాడు.

శబ్దార్థములకు నడుమ అలంకారాదులున్నవి. వానినిలంకరించుటకు, అర్థవక్రత

యననేమి ? లేక అభిధేయవక్రత యననేమి ? పై శ్లోకమందలి 'నితాంతాది మాత్రేణ' <sup>1</sup>  
యననేమి ?

పై శ్లోకముమందింకొక శ్లోకమున్నది. కావ్యభేదమునైన అభ్యాయకాదులను  
గుర్చి చెప్పట ముగించుచు వ్రాసినది

'యుక్తం వక్రస్వభావోక్త్యా సర్వమేవైతదిష్కతే.' 1.20

మున్ను చెప్పబడిన కావ్యములు వక్రస్వభావోక్తిచే సుసంపన్నములు కావలెను. అనగానేమి ?  
వ్యాఖ్యాత — 'కావ్యకే పూర్వలక్షిత సమగ్ర భేద వక్రోక్తి తథా స్వభావోక్తినే యుక్త హోనే  
చాహియే'.

ఇచట స్వభావోక్తి యనగా నాపేరుగల యకంబారమా :

వక్రస్వభావోక్తి<sup>2</sup>

కావ్యము — నాట్యము, లోకధర్మ — నాట్యధర్మ స్వరూపము.

'త్రైలోక్యాస్యాస్య నాట్యం భావానుకీర్తనం' (న.కా. 1. 107)

నాట్యధర్మకాధారము లోకధర్మ. నాట్యముచే లోకసామాన్య విషయము విశేషవిషయ  
మగుచున్నది. 'తేనానుష్యవసాయవత్ విశేష విషయాకార్యం నాట్యం' (అభినవభారతి,  
అ 1 — పు. 37). అభినయము అభినేతవ్యమైన లోకధర్మ నాటనలచేయే యుండును.

'అభినయాశ్చ లోకీకం ధర్మం తస్మాద్వివేక తమచరీరితం

సామయికం వానువర్తంత ఇత్యర్థి సవచంతరిం భర్తే

న చాభినయోఽభినేతవ్యమంతరేణాస్తిత'. (అభినవభారతి, పు. 269)

కొన్నిచోట్ల లోకధర్మకి వ్యతిరేకమైన వైచిత్ర్యమును విజ్ఞానవైచిత్ర్యకై నిబంధించవలెనని  
లాస్యాంగవిషయమున శ్రీమదభినవులు వ్రాసిన మాటలనుసరించియు కవులు కేవల నాట్య  
ధర్మని నిబంధించుట కవిలోక ప్రసిద్ధమైన విషయమే.

.....  
1. ఈ శ్లోక వ్యాఖ్యలో వాఖ్యాని దీని యర్థము జోరవడిలేదని వ్రాసినాడు.

ఇన్ కారికా మే నితాంతాది అంశకా అర్థ సూర్త్య స్పష్ట హింః ప్రా  
సభీ నే శించ కాన్ కరోతే అర్థసంగతి కా ప్రియాన్ కియా హేః

— శ్లోకచరితాభిరూపా.

2. శ్రీ డి. టి. తాతాచార్యులుగారు 'వక్రస్వభావోక్త్యా' యన్నచాని 'వక్రస్వభావోక్త్యా' గా  
గ్రహించి దండివలె చామరూపును వాక్యమును స్వభావోక్తి - వక్రోక్తులుగా విభ  
జించిరని డా॥ రామవర్మగారు Some concepts of Alamkāra Śāstra (పు. 102) లో  
వ్రాసి యిది సరిగాదనిరి. ఇది దండియర్హయముగాని చామరూపినికాదు కావున,  
ఇట్లు పిరుగు పైమాటార్థమేమో సరిగా నిర్ణయించలేదు.

అమం న రశనోత్కర్షి పీనస్తనవిమర్దనః

నాభ్యురుజమనస్పర్శి నీవీప్రసంపనః కరః. (త్రీపర్వము, అధ్యాయము, 14)

పౌలికలనులో నిట్లు దుఃఖించుట లోకధర్మి కాదు. ఐనను శృంగారము కరుణ పరిపోషణము నకై గ్రహింపబడినది. ఇది కేవల నాట్యధర్మి. ప్రౌఢకవి నిర్మాణము రెంటినొకదాని ప్రక్కనికొకటిపెట్టి చూపించుటచే కరుణరసోల్పణము స్నిగ్ధముగా సనుభూయమాన మగుచున్నది.

సామాన్యముగా లోకధర్మి ననుసరించియే యభినేయము — కావ్యము ప్రవర్తించి తీరును. నాట్యధర్మి సహితమైన లోకధర్మితో కావ్యము కూడియుండవలెనని పై శ్లోకమున భామహాదు చెప్పుచున్నాడు

కేవల లోకధర్మి వార్త. నాట్యధర్మి వక్రోక్తి. సాధ్యము వక్రత. ఇచట స్వభావోక్తి లోకధర్మియన్న యర్థమున ప్రయోగించబడినదే. కేవలాలంకార దృష్టితోకాదు.

చెప్పబోవు శబ్దాలంకారగతమైన వక్రత — ఏకవాక్యగత వక్రత — మహావాక్య గత వక్రతయై భాసించినచో నది ప్రబంధవక్రత.

ప్రబంధ విషయమునవాడిన వక్రతాశబ్దముచే నిది ప్రబంధవక్రత. పైన పేర్కొనబడిన 'నిశాంతాది మాత్రేణ' — యనగా విషయవక్రత క్రింద వ్రాయబడును.

### విషయవక్రత

మూడవ శ్లోకముననున్న వక్రతయొక్క అర్థమును నిర్ణయించి తదుపరి రెండవ శ్లోకమును విచారించుము.

రెండవశ్లోక వాక్య సందర్భమిది.

'దృష్టాంతమరగా ఉక్తార్థ ప్రతిబింబ నిదర్శనము'. ఉదా :-

'భవానిహ శ్రేయాన్ వృద్ధానుశిష్టత్వాత్పూర్వే కార్తయగే యథా'

ఎక్కడ దృష్టాంతమాత్రమున సాధ్యసాధనము వ్యంజింపబడునో అక్కడ శుద్ధ దృష్టాంతము చెప్పుదుము. ఎట్లనగా

"ఓయీ పీరుడా! నీవే భరతుడవు. ఐదుడవు. పుహరవుడవు ప్రద్యుమ్నుడవు. నరవాహనుడవు"

ఇట్లే కవదముచేతి నే యాయా గుణములెట్లు వ్యంజింపబడును? అని విచారించి విస్తరభీరులైన కొందఱు కవులెట్లు ప్రయోగించుదు. సాధువైనచో నొక్కపదమేని చాలు. విపరీతమైనచో ప్రబంధమే! అపయశస్కరమే.

కొన్ని కావ్యములు రసవత్తరములయ్యు నహృద్యములు అనునిర్మితములు. నైకపితౌ పమానములగుచున్నవి. ఇతర కవులు కొందఱు భాస్వరములు, ఫలవైష్ణవములు, పుల్లకుసుమములు ఇట్టి సుకుమారద్రవ్యములచే వాణి నలంకరించుచున్నారు. ఇట్టి వానిచే భూషణములు, ఉపవనములు, మాలలు నలంకృతములగునేమో కాని కావ్యముకాదు. వాణి నలంకరించునదేమి ?

‘వాదాం వక్త్రాశ్చక్షోక్తిరలంకారాయ కల్పితే’ —

ఈ సందర్భమును దృష్టిలో నిడుకొని దీనిని చూడవలెను.

విస్తరభీరులైన మహాకవుల వర్ణనపద్ధతి భుద్ధిస్థాంతమునకుదాహరణముగ చూపించి యాపద్ధతి గొప్పదనమును సూచించెను. కావ్యము శబ్దార్థభయము కావున సుభయగతముగా కౌత్సత యుండవలెను. దానివలన కావ్యమునకు కుడింపు - బిగింపు వచ్చును. కావ్యమున కౌత్సత హెచ్చినచో నది దుష్పద్యమగుట తప్పదు. అప్పుడది కపిత్థోపమానమగును. ఇది దోషము. కౌత్సతోపాటు ప్రసన్నత యుండవలెను. కాఠిన్యము పనికిరాదు. ఇది గౌడీయప్రియులకు హెచ్చరిక. వారి రచనలో కౌత్సత, కాఠిన్యములుండునన్న మూట. మఱి కాఠిన్యము పనికిరాదు.

కొందఱు దీనికి పృథిరేముగ విస్తరించి వ్రాయుదురట. వారి కావ్యములు పదవిరోధము - అస్వరసార్థములు కలిగి బహుపూరణములై అనాకులములై యుండునట. దీని కుదాహరణము 5.68.

ఈ శ్లోకమున వట్టి సమాసపుకంప తప్ప అర్థమేమియు లేదు. ఏలా, ఏక్వోల, చందళ, స్పందన, ఇట్టి శబ్దాలంకారములు కేవల శ్రుతిపేశలములై గేయ లక్షణమును పెంపొందించునేకాని కావ్యత్వసిద్ధిని కల్గింపనేరవు. పద్యమును సాగదీయుట అర్థగాంభీర్యము చెడినది.

ఇది వైదర్భకావ్యలక్షణము ఇద్దఱయందును దోషాదోషము చేసినారు. ఆయన దృష్టిలో రెండును కావ్యములుకావు. కావ్యమునకు ప్రాణభూతమైనది వక్రత. ✓

కపిత్థకావ్యములనుగూర్చి వ్రాసిన తర్వాత రెండు చూడు శ్లోకములు వ్రాసెను. (5.64, 65, 66). వీనియందు తటస్థోద్ధీపన సాదుగ్రియైన ఉపవన పృక్షవర్ణనము కావలెన

బడెను. అది బైదర్భీప్రియుల కిష్టసామగ్రి. కొందఱు కపులకు సుకుమారవస్తు గ్రథనమే కావ్యమనిపించును.

మధురములైన శబ్దరూపరసగంధాదులు లోకమున మధురానుభూతికి కారణముగావున్నవి. శ్రీఖండమల్లీ పృష్ఠాక్షులు, దుచిరాకారములు, మృదుశబ్దములు, స్వాదుస్పర్శ నొసగు ద్రవ్యములు ఋజుమార్గమున వక్రతాపీనముగ గ్రథించినంతనే కావ్యత్వమబ్బిన యెడల లోకకవస్తు సౌందర్యముకంటె కావ్యమేమి గొప్ప ?

“The appearances of Natural objects are in themselves meaningless, the essential thing is feeling.”

(Malvich మాటలుగా Krishnachaitanya: *Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 16)

‘భామహాదు ప్రతిభాశాలి’ — ఈ వాక్యమిట్లు వాచ్యార్థముఖమున చెప్పినచో తత్ప్రతిభ యెట్లననుభూతమో యట్లే సుందరవస్తుగ్రథనము ఋజుముఖముననున్నచో సౌందర్యానుభూతికల్గదనుటకాశ్లోకములుదాహరించినా దాదాప్యము. సౌందర్యము వార్తాముఖముగా అనుభవమునకు రాదు. పై శ్లోకములు వార్తలవంటివి.

“Describe not the object, but the effect of it produces. Therefore a verse cannot be composed of words but of intentions. All words must yeild to sensation.”

(Mallarme మాటలుగా *Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 16 లో ఉదాహృతము)

హృదయనివిషయము కాగల కావ్యార్థము వక్రోక్తిముఖముననే అనుభవమునకు వచ్చును. అది లేనిచో వస్తువీకరణము లేదు. ఇదిలేనిచో వక్రత లేదు.

సౌందర్యము వస్తుగతముకాదు. కవి మనోధర్మము. ఆతని నిర్మాణముననుండును. వస్తుసౌందర్యము లోకధర్మి. ఏ విషయము వర్ణింపబడినను నాట్యధర్మి సుందరమే. కావున విషయము వక్రతాముఖమున నిబంధించుట నాట్యధర్మి కావ్యము. సుకుమార సుచరవస్తు గ్రథనము కాదు. ఇది భావహాని భావము. ధ్వన్యాలోకమందలి ‘దృష్టపూర్వా అపి హ్యర్థాః’ అన్న శ్లోకమున చెప్పబడిన విషయమే భామహాదీ సందర్భమున నన్నది.

లోకధర్మిని యథాతథముగా చిత్రింపక వక్రమార్గమున నిబంధించుటయే విషయ వక్రతయని పై సందర్భము ద్రువీకరించుచున్నది.

నితాంతాది మాత్రేణ (1.66) దీనికర్థము.

జహు పూరణమాకులం 5.67. ఇందలి జహుపూరణము.

కొందఱు కవులు విస్తరించి వ్రాయదురన్నాడుకదా. ఆ వార్తారూప విస్తృతి - తటస్థోద్ధీప విభావ సామగ్రియైన మధురవస్తు భాహుళ్యగ్రథనము - నితాంత శబ్దార్థము. వస్తుభాహుళ్య గ్రథనమున జుగుప్స - గ్రామ్యత - వార్త సిద్ధించునేకాని వక్రత - కావ్యప్రాణము సిద్ధించదు. పుష్పాదులచే మాలలలంకృతములగును గాని వాణి కాదన్నాడుకదా !

ఈ నితాంతత శబ్దపరముగను చూడవచ్చు. విషయపరముగా సహజ సుందరవస్తు భాహుళ్యగ్రథనమైనట్లు శబ్దపరముగ మధురనాదము సహజముగగల యక్షరముల విస్తృతి. అది గ్రామ్యానుప్రాసలక్షణమని భామహుడు.

అలంకారపరముగ చూచినచో అనేకోపమాన నిబంధనము. (ఇది అలంకార వక్రతలో వచ్చును.)

కవి విస్తరభీరువు కావలెను. అట్టివాడు సమర్థ నాథు శబ్దముచే అనంతార్థమును సాధింపగలడు.

నితాంతత యిట్టిదైనచో భామహుడిచ్చిన ఉదాత్తాలంకారోదాహరణము (8.12. 13) ఎట్లు సమర్థనీయము ? మఱి 6.64, 65, 66 శ్లోకములెట్లు నిందార్థములు : ఉదాత్తాలంకారము గ్రధింపబడిన రత్నాది విషయమునందైశ్వర్యముంకు వ్యంజకమై అలంకారత్వము సిద్ధించుచున్నది. ఇదే వక్రత. నిందార్థములైన పైశ్లోకములు ఋజుమార్గమున నున్నవి. అనగా వ్యంజకములుకాలేదు. కావున విశేషార్థ వ్యంజకత వక్రత. అది లేకుండ అందములగు ద్రవ్యములకూర్పు నితాంతత. కావున విశేషార్థ వ్యంజకముగా విషయగ్రథనముండవలెను.

ఈ దృష్టితోడనే - సుందరశబ్దనితాంత గ్రథన దృష్టితోడనే భామహుడు

న లోలమాలాలీనానికులాకులగలో బలః 2.6.

దీనిని గ్రామ్యానుప్రాసకుదాహరించి తన ఏవగింపును తెలియజేసెను. దీని వ్యాఖ్యానమున దేవేంద్రనాథశర్మగారు జయదేవుని యీ గీతపాదము

లలితలవంగలతాపరిశీలనకోమలమలయసమీరే -

ఉదాహరించి యివటకూడ లకారభాహుళ్యముండుటచే గ్రామ్యానుప్రాస యనవలసినదేనా యనిరి. భామహుని భావమిదికాదు. జయదేవుని గీతికలో లలిత - లవంగలతా - పరిశీలన - కోమలమలయ - ఇట్లు విశ్రాంతిచిక్కి మాధుర్యహేతువగుచున్నది. భామహోదారణమున వ్యాఖ్యాంతముదనుక విశ్రాంతి చిక్కదు. ఇట్లవిశ్రాంతముగా - నితాంతముగ - ఏకాక్షర పునరావృత్తి గ్రామ్యానుప్రాస.



వక్రత - అనుభవైక వేద్యము. కావుననే ఆచార్యుడు విదిముఖమున నిరూపింపక వ్యతిరేకముఖమున ధ్వనింపజేసెను. వక్రత ఏమి ద్రవ్యవిశేషమా ? ఇట్టిదని ఋణావుగా చెప్పుటకు అది మానసికమైన సుకుమారానుభవము. అది యిట్టిదని మనమే రూపించుకొనుటకు వదలివేసెను.

వక్రతాముఖ విషయ నిబంధనమనగా భవభూతి మాలతీమాధవప్రస్తావనలో కెప్పిన చిత్రకథ, లేక వికటకథ. విషయవైచిత్ర్యే విషయవక్రత.

### అలంకారవక్రత

అతిశయోక్తినిగూర్చి చర్చించు సందర్భమున రెండవశ్లోకము (చూ. మొదటి పుట) వ్రాయబడెను. కావున నిది అలంకారవక్రత.

1. అతిశయోక్తియే సమగ్రవక్రోక్తి.
2. దీనిచే నర్థము విభావ్యము.
3. దీనికంటె నన్యాలంకారములేదు
4. కవులు ప్రయత్నించి సాధించదగినదిదే.

కావ్యార్థమలౌకిక వైచిత్ర్యసారమైన రసము. తదభివ్యక్తికరజ్ఞార్థముపయోగించునది వక్రోక్తి. అనగా నాట్యధర్మి భామహునకు రసవిషయము పట్టినట్లులేదు. అతనికి చమత్కృతి అనగా వక్రతయే పట్టినది. శబ్దచర్చలో ఆరవ అవ్యాయమున వ్యంజనచారుతా (ఇది శబ్ద వక్రతక్రింద చర్చింపబడును) శబ్దమున్నది. కావున వక్రత - చారుత - చమత్కృతి సమానార్థకములు.

సర్వాలంకారమూలకము అతిశయోక్తియే యని ధ్వన్యాలోకము. దాని ననుసరించి కాద్యప్రకాశికయు సంగీకరించిన సంగతి విదితమే.

అతిశయోక్తి విశేషలక్షణము - అనగా సర్వాలంకార విశేషలక్షణము వక్రత.

వామఁడన్నట్లు సౌందర్యమలంకారముకాగా అలంకార సౌందర్యము వక్రత. కేవల లక్షణము సరిపడినంతనే యలంకారముండదుగదా. అలంకార ప్రతీతియెప్పుడు ?

1. ప్రథమం కావదతిశయోక్తిగర్భితా సర్వాంకారేషు శక్యత్రయా శృతైవ చ సామహాకవిభిః కామపి కావ్యచ్ఛాయాం పుష్కలితి (ధ్వ.లో.)  
సర్వత్ర ఏవం విధి విషయేఽతిశయోక్తిరేవ ప్రాణశ్వేనావశ్యితే  
కాం వినా ప్రాయేణాలంకారత్వాయోగాత్ (కావ్యప్ర)

వామసుడువమాప్రాధాన్యవాది. అతిశయోక్తి ప్రాధాన్యమనుభవముఖముగానన్నది. ఉపమాప్రాధాన్యము శాస్త్రద్వైపితో వచ్చినది.

అలోకసామాన్యానుభవము కల్గినతర్వాత, హృదయమెప్పుడు చమత్కృతమగునో! అప్పుడే అలంకారాదులను గుర్తించుట జరుగును. ఇందుచేతనే కుంతకుడు వాసననుసరించి తర్వాతివారు చాల అలంకారములందు సౌందర్యము లేదని నిరూపించి తిరస్కరించిరి. ఈ దృష్టి భామహుననుసరించిన కుంతకుడు విస్తరించి హేతు - సూక్ష్మ - లేక - విశేషోక్త్యాదులలంకారములే కావు పొమ్మన్నాడు. కావ్యలింగమును కొందఱు తిరస్కరించిరి. రుక్మకమమ్మటాదులు కొన్నిటిని తీసివేసిరి. ఎందుచేత - వక్రతాహైన్యముచేత? లేనిచో 'ఇది స్థాయిదా. మనుష్యుడా.' అన్నచోటను సందేహము చెప్పవలయును. కావున అలంకార సౌందర్యము వక్రత. కావలసినది లక్షణపుష్టి కాదు. సహృదయ తుష్టి. ఇందుచేతనే ఆనుమానాలంకార విషయమున రుక్మకుడు

'విచ్ఛిత్తి విశేషశ్చ ఆత్ర ఆర్థాశ్రయణీయః అన్యథా తర్హానుమానాత్ కిం వైలక్షణ్యం' - ఇట్లు వ్రాసెను. లేనిచో తార్కికానుమానము - కావ్యానుమానము నొకటియే. ఇందుచే 'వైచిత్ర్యమలంకారః' (కావ్యప్ర.)

ఈ వక్రతకు వ్యతిరేకముగ భామహుడు వార్తనుదహరించెను.

గతో ననుర్థో భాతీందు ర్యాంతి వాసాయ పక్షిణః

ఇత్యేవమాది కిం కావ్యం వార్తా మేనాం ప్రచక్షతే. 2.87.

ఇది స్వభావోక్తికాదా? లేక దండియన్నట్లు హేత్వలంకారమేల కారాదు.

భామహుని పరిశీలన చాల నిగూఢము. నిశితము. అతని అలంకారవిషయ పరిశీలనలో రెండు పద్ధతులున్నవి.

1 తనకు నచ్చినది స్పష్టముగ తెగవేసి చెప్పుట.

2. నచ్చని దాని నితరులిట్లందురనుట.

ఈ రెండవపద్ధతి గ్రామ్యానుప్రాస, స్వభావోక్తి, ఆశీ - మొదలైనవానివివరణ సందర్భముననున్నది.

గ్రామ్యానుప్రాస మన్యత్తు మన్యంతే సుదియో పరే 2.8

స్వభావోక్తి రలంకారా ఇతి కేచి త్పురక్షతే 2.93

ఆశీ రపి చ కేషాంచి దలంకారతయా మతా. 3.55

ఇట్లునుట తానంగీకరించి యంగీకరించకుండుట. తన విచారణలో నిగ్గుదేలినవానిని నటికి నట్లు చెప్పును.

కావున స్వభావోక్తి వేఱు - వార్త వేఱని భామహ నిశితపరిశీలన. వార్త వక్రోక్తులు విరుద్ధ శబ్దములు.

స్వభావోక్తి గ్రామ్యయైనచో వార్త.

వార్త అగ్రామ్యయైనచో స్వభావోక్తి

అచారతా హేతువుచేత పై భావహోదాహరణ వార్త. స్వభావోక్తి చాగువద్యస్తువర్ణనము. కాక ఆ శ్లోకము కాలనివేదనము చేయుటకు వ్యంజకమైనపుడు దండియన్నట్లు అలంకారమే. భావహానకిది తెలియకకాదు తెలియునని ఇతర సందర్భములు ద్రువపరచుచున్నవి కావున. స్వభావోక్తి లోకధర్మి నూతగాగొన్నది. వక్రోక్తి నాట్యధర్మి. దండి లోకధర్మి ప్రాధాన్యవాది. భావహాను నాట్యధర్మి ప్రాధాన్యవాది<sup>1</sup>. కావున వక్రత లేకుండుటచే నది వార్త. ఇందుచేతనే హేతు - సూక్ష్మ - లేకాదులు వక్రోక్తిలేమిచే అనలంకారములన్నాడు (2.86).

వాస్తవికవస్తుగోపనముండుటచే అపహ్నావము అభీష్టమట (మిక్కిలి రమణీయము). భావనచే వస్తువు నపహ్నావించుట అపహ్నావము. లోకవిషయగోపనము - వాస్తవిక వస్తుగోపనము చేసి యన్యవస్తువు నారోపించుట యనగా లోకధర్మి నాట్యధర్మిగా చేయుట. ఈ భావన లోకీకవాననామగ్న చిత్తములను భావనామయములుగా చేయును. ఈ శక్తి వక్రోక్తిదే.

అనయార్థో విభావ్యతే - యనగా వక్రోక్తి. అనిగా నాట్యధర్మి సంబంధియైన భావన. దీనిచే వక్రత - చారుత-విభావింపబడును. కావున అపహ్నావాద్యలంకారములందు వస్త్రపహ్నాతియుండుటచే అభీష్టములు

వక్రతాసిద్ధికి రెండుమూడు మెట్లు.

1. వార్తాపరిహరణము (గ్రామ్యతానిరాసము)

2. అగ్రామ్యత్వాదానము

3. చారుతా సంపాదనము (చూ. శబ్దవక్రత)

అలంకారదోషములు యమకోపమల విషయమున సూచించెను

నానాధాత్వర్థ గంభీరములై యమక వ్యపదేశములై ప్రహేళకప్రాయములైన యమకములు హేయములు. (2.16)

ఉపమాగతములుగా హీనతా - అసంభవ, భిన్నలింగజచనాదులచే కొన్ని దోషములు, వీనిని పరిహరించుకోవలయును. అసంభవ దోషమునకు భావహూడిచ్చిన యుదాహరణము.

నిష్పేతురాస్యాదివతస్య దీప్తాః

శరాధనుర్మండలమధ్యభాజః

1 న కాంత మపి నిర్మామ విభాతి పనితాననమ్. (1.13)

జాజ్వల్యమానా ఇవ వారిధారా  
దినార్థభాజః పరివేషణోర్గాత్. (2.47)

కథం పాతోంబుధారాజాం జ్వలంతీనాం వివర్జితః  
అసంభవా దయం యుక్త్యా తేనసంభవ ఉచ్యతే. (2.48)

అసంభవము — ఉపమానగతాతిశయోక్తి (2.49, 50) వేరుగా చెప్పబడి  
గమనింపదగినది

ఈ దోషములు వక్రతాభంజకములు, వానిచే కావ్యార్థభావన కుదురదు.

శబ్దాలంకారగతముగా గ్రామ్యానుప్రాస కుదాహరించిన శ్లోకమున అవిశ్రాంత  
ముగ<sup>1</sup> ఏకాక్షర పునరావృత్తి జుగుప్సావహమనుటలో నది వక్రతాభంజకమనుచున్నాడు.

అనుప్రాస మువిధములు. పరుషా - ఉపనాగరకా-గ్రామ్యా భేదములే. కాని  
భామహుడు పరుషనుదాహరింపలేదు.

శబ్దపరముగా ఏకాక్షరపునరావృత్తి యెట్లు గ్రామ్యమో బహువచనములను  
ఏక మైన ఉపమేయమునకు వాడుటయు నట్లే. ఈ అనేకోపమాదోషము భరతుని ఏకార్థ  
దోషము నొకటియే (చూ.నా.శా XVI. 92) ఇట్లే మాలోపమాను లర్పరములు.

ఇట్టి దోషపరిహారమున గ్రామ్యత సిద్ధించును. ఇది యే వక్రత కాదు. దీనికిది  
యాధారము. అనగా చిత్రరచనకు స్వచ్ఛపట్టాదులవంటిదగ్రామ్యత. అగ్రామ్యమైన  
అలంకారముకూడ నెట్లుండునో యొకచో సూచించెను. (2.18)

వక్రోక్తి సహితమైన అతిశయోక్తి = వక్రత.

చారుత చమత్కార రహితమైనది - వక్రతలేనిది = కేవలాలంకారోక్తి.

- .....  
1. ఇందు తేజనే ఉద్భటుడు 'శేషైర్వర్తైర్యథా యోగం కోమలాఖ్యాయా' 1.5. లాకాదమలను  
యథోచిత స్థానములందు విన్యసించవలెనని -

శ్లో లోలాలింగాలాసాం కలైః కోలాహలైః (1.5,

ఈ ఉదాహరించిన శ్లోకమునకు భామహుడుదాహరించిన

న లోలమాల్లాభినాలికులాకులగలో లలిః (2.6)

అన్నదానికిని భేదమున్నది. ఇందు జుగుప్సా, అందు సౌకుమార్యము.

ఈ గ్రామ్యానుప్రాస విషయమున భామహోద్భటులు భిన్నాభిప్రాయములు. భామహుడు  
గ్రామ్యకర్తము గ్రామ్యతయని, ఉద్భటుడు మార్గవము (smooth బిన్నట్టి అనువాదము) గా  
భావించుటయే భేదాభిప్రాయము.

| అతిశయోక్తి కావ్యమునక లౌకికత్య మాపాదించినచో వక్రోక్తి రామణీయకాపాదకము భామహుడిచ్చిన ఉదాహరణమున నిది యున్నది.

కృత్రిమాతిశయోక్తులు - అనుభవ పరమార్థములు కావివి. కేవలాతిశయోక్తులు లక్షణమునకు సరిపడినవన్నమాట.

వక్రత లేకుండుటచే లేశసూక్ష్మదులలంకారములు కావు. మిగిలినవానియందు కొంతకు కొంత వక్రతయున్నది. అతిశయోక్తియందు సమగ్రముగ నున్నది.

ఐనచో భామహుడుదాహరించిన ప్రేయస్సమాహితరసవత్ క్రమాలంకారము లందు వక్రత యున్నదా ?

అద్య యా మమ గోవింద జాతా త్వయి గృహగతే

కాలేనైషా భవేత్ పీతి స్తవైవాగమనా త్పునః. 3.5

ఇది విదురుని ప్రియతరాభ్యాసము, ప్రేయోలంకారము. ఇందందమేమి ? ఈ ప్రియమెవరికి ? విదురునకై నచో పాఠకునకెట్లు ? ఇతనికగుటలో వక్రత భాసించును కాని, పాత్రకగుటలో కాదే. ఇచట విషయము ఋజుమార్గమున నున్నదేకాని వక్రోక్తి ముఖమున లేదే ? విషయవక్రతలో వీనిని తిరస్కరించినాడుకదా భామహుడు ? అట్లే క్రమాలంకారము. అపక్రమ (syntactical irregularity) పరిహరణరూపమైన యిది అలంకారమా అపక్రమ పరిహరణమున గ్రామ్యతతోలగి అగ్రామ్యత అనుసంధానిత మగునంతే. మరి వైచిత్రీ - వక్రత కదా అలంకార ప్రాణము ? క్రమమును కుంతకాదులు నిరసించిరి. కావుననే రుద్ర్యకగ్రంథవ్యాఖ్యానమున నీ వాక్యమున్నది.

'దోషాభావమాత్రం చ నాలంకారత్వం. తస్య కవిప్రతిభాత్మక

విచిత్రివిశేషత్వేనోక్తత్వాత్'

(నిర్ణయసాగరప్రతి. పు. 177-178)

క్రమముచే వాక్యమునకొక కుదింపు వచ్చుచున్నదని అలంకారమన్నాడా ?

సర్వార్థతైకాగ్రతయోః క్షయోదయో చిత్తస్య సమాధి పరిణామః.

(పాతంజలయోగసూత్రము, 3.11)

ఈకుదింపుపాదేయమే కదా.

చమత్కృతి కావ్యమున ననేక విధములుగా నుండును గావున నిదియు తక్కిన షకమే కావచ్చు.

కొన్ని విషయములు విధిముఖముకంటె వ్యతిరేకములును భాసించును. అనెచిత్తము భాసించినంత త్వరగా నెచిత్తము భాసించదు. కథలో నపక్రమము భాసించినంత త్వరగా క్రమము భాసించదు. సంఘటనాక్రమమును క్రమాలంకారమే కావచ్చు. పూర్వాపర సంఘటనలందలి పౌందిక క్రమమే.

భావికాలంకారము నిజే ప్రబంధవిషయమైన గుణమన్నాడు భామహుడు. (అలంకార విషయమున గుణమన్నమాటను వాడుట సాగనుగానున్నది అతిశయోక్తి విషయమునను 284 గుణాతిశయయోగమన్నాడు

భూత భవిష్యత్కథాంశములు వార్తమానిక సత్యములై ప్రత్యక్షమగుట భావికత్వముచేతనే దీనికి హేతువులు - ఈ ప్రత్యక్షకల్ప సంపేదనానిర్భూతికి కారణ సామగ్రి అర్థమునందు వైచిత్రి - ఉదాత్తత - అద్భుతలక్షణములుండుట. ఈ యొక్క అభినేయత, శబ్దానాకులత.

దృశ్యకావ్యము స్వభిన్నీకమగును<sup>1</sup> గావున రసానుభూతి సుగమము. శ్రవ్యకావ్యమున రసానుభూతి యెట్లు? కొందఱు లేదనగా గుప్తపాదుల గురువులు భట్టలేరులు కావ్యము నాట్యాయమానమైనచో రసానుభవము శ్రవ్యమునను కుదురుననిరి. నాట్యాయమాన మెట్లగును? దీనిని వివరించుచు వ్రాసిన శ్లోకము.

1. There does not seem to be any reference to drama or *abhinaya* here in the expression కథాయాః స్వభిన్నీకతా. There is a reading స్వపీనీకతా which the *Jayamaṅgala* supports."

(Some concepts of *Alaṅkāra Śāstra*, p. 119.)

జయమంగళ వ్యాఖ్య స్వవిన్నీకతా = సుబోధతా - యన్నరని వాసిరి. (చూ. పై గ్రంథము. పు 20). ఉద్భటుడు భావిక లక్షణమున కథాయాః స్వభిన్నీకతా - యన్నమాట చేర్చుకుంటు కు కారణము:

"Perhaps honesty is responsible for Udbhaṭa's omission of this un-understandable bit." (పై గ్రంథము 1:2)

కాని ఉద్భట గ్రంథవ్యాఖ్యలో ప్రతిహాసేందురాజు మాత్రము స్వభిన్నీకతనే గ్రహించెనని పై పండితుడే వ్రాసెను

స్వభిన్నీకతేఽభినయాదిద్వారేణ శృంగారాది రససంపత్తీకర్తవం  
చతుర్వర్గోపాయ శ్చ ఉక్తం. (ప్రతిహాసేందురాజు)

ఐనపుడు un-understandable bit ఏమిటి? అప్పుడు పాశాంతంమైన స్వవిన్నీకతను గ్రహించు తెుందుకు? రసమభినయములునునే కదా అభివ్యక్తిమగుట రసాదిమును సహృదయ హృదయోన్ముఖముగా నానయనయముచేయు నాట్యార్థి అభినయము.

వర్ణనోక్తిలితాః భోగప్రాధోక్త్యా సమ్యగర్పితాః  
ఉద్యానకాంతాచంద్రాద్యాఃభావాః ప్రత్యక్షవత్ స్ఫుటాః.

రసమునకుబదులు వక్రతపట్టిన భామహుడు పై విధముగా వ్రాయుట కావ్య వక్రత అవరోక్షనుభూతియై చమత్కృత్యనియమే భావించెననవచ్చు భూతిభవిష్యత్తులు వర్తమానమందు లయించుట ఏకాగ్రతాసిద్ధి. దీనికి హేతువు కథాభినీతత. కావ్యమనుభావ ముఖమున ప్రదర్శితమగుటయే రససిద్ధి హేతువు. అదే అభినీతత. ఆరమందు వైచిత్రీ - అద్భుతత్వముండుట యనగా కవి ప్రయత్నించి నాట్యధర్మిని సంగృహీతము చేయుట. అదిలేనిది వట్టికథ ఉన్నది కావ్యము, వక్రోక్తి, భటతౌతుల ప్రాధోక్తి కల్పన భామహుని వక్రోక్తి. సాధ్యము వైచిత్రీ - వక్రత. వర్ణనమన్నమాట భామహుడు వాడకున్నను భట్ట తౌతునికంటె ముందు శిష్యమభినీతమైననే వక్రతా (రస) సిద్ధి యని చెప్పినవాడు భామ హుడు. ప్రత్యక్ష సంవేదన ఉదయించుటకు కావ్యమభినీతము కావలసినదే యని చెప్పుటచే భామహుని ప్రతిభ నిశితముగా వెలుగొందుచున్నది.

కావున వక్రోక్తి నాట్యధర్మి - వార్తాదులు లోకధర్మి. అలంకారములకు వైచిత్రీ నద్దనది వక్రోక్తి. ఇది అలంకార వక్రత.

#### 4. శబ్దవక్రత - వ్యంజనాచారత - అక్షరరమ్యత

ఆరవ అధ్యాయమున 31-వ శ్లోకమున మఱల వక్రశబ్దము ప్రయోగించబడెను. అటనుండి తుదిదాక శబ్దసంస్కారమును గూర్చియే యాయన బహుధా పరిశీలించెను. కావున దీనిని శబ్దవక్రత యనవచ్చు.

కావ్యమునందు ప్రతిశబ్దము ప్రయోగార్హము కాదని 6.23-30 శ్లోకములందు పూర్వరంగ మేర్పరచుకొనెను. ఇందు కావ్యాన్వర్త శబ్దవిచారణమున్నది.

అప్రయుక్త - దుర్బోధ - అపేక్షల - గ్రామ్య - అపార్థక - అప్రతితాదిపదాలు కావ్యమున ప్రయోగించరాదు.

అప్రయుక్తత ప్రసిద్ధికి వ్యతిరేకము. ఇది శబ్దగతమేకాదు కథాగతమును. నాటకమున నప్రసిద్ధివృత్తముండరాదన్నదిందుకే. కథాప్రసిద్ధి యనగా -

ప్రఖ్యాతోదాత్త నాయకత్వము - రాజప్రసిద్ధి - కథాప్రసిద్ధి యని అభినవభారతి. రసప్రతీతివిఘ్నములలో మొదటిదైన 'ప్రతిపత్తావయోగ్యతా సంభాషనావిరహః' - యన్నదానిని తొలగించునది ప్రసిద్ధివృత్తనిర్వహణ దానిచే కథాగతాసంభాష్యత్వాదులు భాసించక కథానిమగ్నత సుకరమగును. ఇట్లే శబ్దప్రసిద్ధి అర్థసౌలభ్య హేతువు.

దుర్బోధములైన శ్రౌతాదిశబ్దములు, దుష్టాద్యపేశల శబ్దాలు, పిండిహారాది గ్రామ్యపదాలు, డిద్ధాద్యపార్థకములు ప్రయోగానర్హములు. అట్లే లేశ జ్ఞాపకాకృష్టములును.

శబ్దము భ్రమోత్పాదకము కారాదు. ప్రసన్నత యుండవలెను. అప్రతీతాప్రయత్నములు భ్రమోత్పాదకములు. కవి యుద్దేశితార్థము వీనిచే తెలియదు. రెండుమూలార్థములందే కవి యుద్దేశించినది? ఈ ప్రశ్న కల్పించునది అప్రతీతాప్రయత్నములు. దుర్బోధములనే అనలర్పనిర్ణయమే కుదురదు. అపేశల పదము - ఇందర్ప నిర్ణయము కుదురును కాని అర్థమందువాత్తత యుండదు. గ్రామ్యశబ్దముచే జగుప్స కలిగి కావ్యానుభూతి భస్మస్తమగును. తాటస్యదోషముపపన్నమై కావ్యము పాఠకులు వేరగుదురు. అపార్థకమనగా నిర్దర్శకము - అర్థరహితము, కావ్యార్థము భావ్యము. భావన కలిగించుటకు పిలుచెని డిద్ధాదులిట్టివి. అవి ద్రవ్యబోధకములేకాని కావ్యార్థవంతములు కావు. ఇట్లొకక్రమమున అనర్హశబ్ద విచారణ జరిగినది. ఆ పరుసలో ఆ శబ్దముల నిబ్బటచే పై రీతి విచారణ చేయబడెను.

శబ్దము బోధించు నర్థమునకు కొన్ని మెట్లున్నవని భామహుని అభిప్రాయము.

1. కవి ఉద్దేశించిన యర్థమిదియో? అదియో? ఇది సంశయయోగము.
2. అసలీ శబ్దార్థమేమి?
3. శబ్దప్రసన్నత.
4. తెలిసిన అర్థము అగ్రామ్యము కావలెను.
5. లౌకికార్థ ప్రతీతిని కల్పించు డిద్ధాదులు వాడబడినచో వక్రత ఏర్పించదు. ఇట్టివి వార్తాబోధకములు. కావ్యభాష వక్రోక్తి.

ఏ శబ్దము ప్రయోగయోగ్యమో 6.28, 29 శ్లోకములందున్నది. క్రమాగతము - శ్రుతిసుఖము - అర్థ్యము - ప్రయోగయోగ్యములగు శబ్దాలు కవి ప్రయోగించుటకు పీలైనవి.

క్రమాగతము  $\times$  అప్రయత్న, దుర్బోధ, జ్ఞాపకాకృష్టములు.

శ్రుతిసుఖము  $\times$  అపేశలము.

అర్థ్యము  $\times$  అపార్థకము, గ్రామ్యము.

ఈ విషయమెఱుగుటకు వ్యాకరణమే శరణ్యము. కావున వార్తిక - మహాభాష్య ప్రసిద్ధమైన శబ్దమవశ్యముపాస్యము. అట్టి శబ్దమే రమణీయము.

“అతిశేతే హ్య లంకార మన్యం వ్యంజనచారుతా” (6.28)

అన్యాలంకారాతి రిక్తమైనదట శబ్దము. ఈ వ్యంజన (శబ్ద) చారుత్వము 6.29 లోని వక్రత సమానార్థములన్నమాట.

1. వ్యాకృతము కాని ప్రయోగమును వ్యాకృతమైన ఇతర ప్రయోగసామ్యవ్యమున పాఠించున కారణమైన ప్రయోగము జ్ఞాపకము.



కావ్యావృత్తీతి సమర్థకమైన శబ్దము మధుర లేక చారు లేక వక్ర - శబ్దము. ఇట్లు చెప్పి.

సిద్ధో యశోవసంఖ్యానాదిష్ట్యా యశోవసపాఠితః

త మాద్రయేత ప్రాయేణ న తు యోగవిభాగజమ్. (6 29)

ఈ శ్లోకము వ్రాసెను.

ఇందు వా ర్తిక - మహాభాష్య శబ్దములకు జదులుగా ఉపసంఖ్యాన - ఇష్టి అన్న శబ్దప్రయోగము సౌగంధ్యమునున్నది. ఇది పండితక్రమాగతము. శ్రుతిసంఖ్యము - అర్థము నైన శబ్దప్రయోగము. తానుచెప్పిన విషయమును తానే యనుసరించి చూపినాడు. లక్షణమే లక్ష్యమైనది. వ్యాకృతశబ్దము ప్రతిదియు నుపాదేయము కారాదు. దేనిచే వక్రత స్పందించునో యట్టిశబ్దమే అభీష్టము.

సాలాతురీయమతపేతదనుక్రమేణ

కో వక్ష్యతీతి విరతోఽహమతో విచారాత్. (6.62)

<sup>1</sup>తక్షణి దగ్గరనున్న సాలాతుర గ్రామమున జనించినవాడు పాణిని. ఇట్లునక సాలాతురీయు డనుట వ్యంజనచారుత. ఆ ప్రయోగముచే పాణిని యందతనికున్న భక్తిభావము వ్యక్తమగుచున్నది. కావున నిది వక్రోక్తి - వక్రశబ్దము. I.A. Richards చెప్పిన emotive word వక్రోక్తి యొకటే.

అచారువైన వ్యాకృతశబ్దము కవికుపాదేయము కారాదు. వాక్యము అగ్రామ్యము, వక్రత దీని పై విషయము. దీనినాతడు రకరకములుగా నిరూపించెను.

1. ప్రత్యయములు      2. శబ్దములు      3. సంధులు      4. సమాసములు
5. కారకములు.

### 1. ప్రత్యయములు

ఒకేయర్థమున భిన్న ప్రత్యయములను వ్యాకరణము విధింపగా నందేదిచేర్చిన శబ్దము వక్రమగునో యట్టి ప్రత్యయములే చేర్చి వ్రాయుట యిష్టము. ఈ దృష్టితో నాతడు వ్రాసిన విషయమునుండి ఉదాహరణార్థము కొన్నిమాత్రమిట గ్రహింపబడుచున్నవి.

1. Paul Cezanne - అన్నపాశ్చాత్య చిత్రకారుడొక యింటిని చిత్రించెను. ఆ చిత్రమున కాధారమైన ఆ యింటిని photo తీసిరి. రెంటిని ప్రక్కప్రక్కనే ముద్రించి చిత్రము నందు emotion ఉన్నదనిరి. ఇది వక్రత. నాట్యధర్మ. లోకధర్మ బొమ్మకు ఆధారమైన గృహము. ఇది వార్త. వై సాలాతురీయ ప్రయోగమునందు ప్రయోక్త యొక్క భక్తిశ్రద్ధలు వ్యంగ్యములై వక్రొక్తియగుచున్నది.

1. భావమున తద్విప్రత్యయములు త్వ - తల్ - ఇమన్ - ఇట్టివిందగా ఇమన్ - ప్రత్యయాంత శబ్దములిష్టములు.

పటుత్వం - పటుతా - పటిమా. చివరిది కావ్యప్రయోగయోగ్యము.

ద్వివచనవిభజ్యోపపదే తరబీయసునా. (అష్టాధ్యాయ, ౩ ౩ ౧7.)

'తరబీ' కంటే 'ఈ.యసున్' - గ్రాహ్యము.

2. ద్వయసచ్ - మాత్రచ్ - దఘ్నుచ్ ప్రమాణార్థక ప్రత్యయములైన వీనియందు మాత్రచ్ కాక మిగిలిన రెండును గ్రహణయోగ్యములు

జానుదఘ్ని సరిన్నారీనితంబద్వయసం సరః (భాషుహ, 6.15)

3. తస్యేదమ్ (అష్టాధ్యాయ, 4 3, 120).

తస్యేతి పష్టిసమర్థాది దమిత్యేతస్మిన్ విషయే యథావిహితః

ప్రత్యయో భవతి అతాదయః పంచమహోత్సర్గాః. ఘనయశ్చ

ప్రత్యయా యథావిహితం విధీయంతే. (కాశికావృత్తి).

దీనిచే పురందర శబ్దమునకు అణ్ చేర్చగా పౌరందర శబ్దము నిష్పన్నమై దానికి 'టీప్' చేర్చగా పౌరందరీ శబ్దము పుట్టును. అకారాంత టీత్ - ధ - అణ్ - ఇణ్ - ఆది ప్రత్యయాలంత శబ్దాలకు జీప్ చేర్చి స్త్రీలింగాలుగా మార్చి వానిని ప్రయోగించుట సుందరము.

పౌరందరీ లక్ష్మీ - (భాషుహ, 6.11)

4. అభూతతద్భావార్థకములైన భృశాది గణపతిక శబ్దాలకు 'క్యజ్' ప్రత్యయ మగును. అజంతములైనచో భృశాయతే - మందాయతే ఇట్లు గును అట్లే హలంత శబ్దములపై హల్లో ముచేసి 'క్యజ్' చేర్చగా నేర్పడు రూపాలు సుందరములు (6.39); సుమనస్ - సుమనాయతే.

5. శబలాది శబ్దాలకు ణిచ్ చేర్చుట సుందరతము (6.44-45). కట్లాతని విచారణ సాగినది.

## 2. శబ్దములు

వ్యావహారిక శబ్దము వార్త, ముజావు. కావ్యశబ్దము వక్రతోక్తి. ఈ రెండు నొకటి కావు. గ్రామ్యభాష వాచకము, కావ్యభాష లక్షకము వ్యంజకము. కావ్యశబ్దము లాక్షణికము కావలసినదే. లేనిచో వక్రతలేదు. ఈ లక్షణ రూఢి - ప్రయోజనదృష్ట్యంతో నుండును. సామెతలు, జాతీయములు రూఢిలక్షణలు. అలంకారములు ప్రయోజన లక్షణకొడుగునవే. కావున కావ్యభాష అలంకారికమై వక్రతాహేతుకమగుచున్నది.

తిష్ఠద్గుప్రభృతౌ వాచ్యౌ స క్తందివసగోచరౌ

యథా విద్వాన్సదీతే<sup>2</sup>సౌ తిష్ఠద్గు చ వహద్గు చ. (భామహ. 6.35)

వాడు రేయింబవళ్లు చదువుచున్నాడనుట వ్యావహారిక వాక్యము, వార్త. యథా — ఈవాక్యము కావ్యభాష.

తిష్ఠద్గు — గోదోహనకాలము — ఆవులు నిలబడియుండు కాలము = సంధ్యా కాలము : రాత్రి.

వహద్గు — ఆవులు మేతకై తిరుగు కాలము = పగలు.

సాలాకురీయమతమేతత్ — అన్నశ్లోకమున సాలాకురీయ శబ్దము. ఇవి చమత్కారావహములైనట్టివి. ఇట్టివే కావ్యప్రయోగార్హ శబ్దములు.

### 3. సంధులు

భిన్నశబ్దము లతుకునపుడు కాతన్యము కన్పించరాదు. సందియు శబ్దమట్లు మధురముగ నుండవలెను. శ్రవణభారము కారాదు. కొన్ని సమయ మృదులములు, కొన్ని కఠినములు.

1. త వర్ధనకు శ కారము చేర్చగా నేర్పడునవి తచ్చామ వంటివి పనికిరావు<sup>1</sup>.

2. బహుధా సందిగతములుగా ఓకారాలు రాసీయరాదు.

— గతోయాతో హతోయథా, 6.61.

3. వాగ్ధాని — అజ్ఞుల్ వంటివి పనికిరావు.

4 వృద్ధికి వైకల్పికత్వమున్నచోట్ల వృద్ధినిపాటించుట శోభావహము. మృత్ ధాతువునకు ప్రథమైకవచనమున వృద్ధి వైకల్పికము. వృద్ధ్యణావమున మృజంతి. వృద్ధి వచ్చినచో మార్జంతి. ఇది సుందరము. (6 31)

1. కాని భామహుడే 6.44లో ఘనాచ్చలలయంత్యమూ: — అని వైదానికి విరుద్ధముగ వ్రాసెనే ఎట్లన్నచో సాధారణముగ నిట్టివి రాకుండ చూచుకోవలయును. ఇది జ్ఞాపకము కారాదు. ఇదే విషయము.

సూత్రజ్ఞాపకమాత్రేణ వృత్రహంతా యథోదితః

అకేచ స కుర్వీత వృత్తిం తద్గమకో యథా 6.37 లో

చెప్పెను. సూత్రమున విధింపక ప్రయోగవశమున వచ్చినవానిని శాస్త్రీయములుగా గ్రహించి ప్రయోగించరాదు.

#### 4. సమాసములు

1. అవ్యయాదావ్ సుపః (ఆష్టాధ్యాయ, 2.4.82).

అవ్యయాదు త్తరస్యాః సుపశ్చ బిగ్భవతి.

అవ్యయాభావ సమాసమున సుప్ - విభక్తికి లోపముకలుట సామాన్య న్యాయము. కాని అవ్యయాభావమదంతమైనచో సుప్సనకు లోపము రాకపోగా 'అమ్' ఆదేశము గావచ్చును. కాని యిది పంచమిలో రాదు. మిగిలినవానికి వచ్చును.

క. పంచమికి అంభావము రాదు.

గ. తృతీయాస్తపములకు బహుళము.

చ. శేష విభక్తులకు నిత్యము.

దీనిని దృష్టిలో నిడుకొని భామహుడీ శ్లోకము వ్రాసెను.

ప్రయుంజీతావ్యయాభావమదంతం నాప్యపంచమీ

తృతీయాస్తపమిపక్షే నాబిగ్భవయమానయేత్. (6.34)

పంచమిని వదలి సర్వత్ర (తృతీయాస్తపములందు వైకల్పికమైనను) అంభావము పాటించవలెను. అది సుందరము కావున

2. ఆకారాంతో త్తరపదో ద్విగుః స్త్రీయామిష్టః (వార్తికము).

ఆకారాంతో త్తరపదద్విగువునకు 'జీప్' చేర్చి స్త్రీలింగముగా చేయుట ఇష్టము.

ఉత్తరపదము స్త్రీలింగమై 'ఆప్' కలదైనచో స్త్రీ లింగమునకు వైకల్పికము.

అట్లే ఉత్తరపదము 'అన్' గా నున్నను.

పాత్రాద్యుత్తర పదాలున్నచో స్త్రీలింగమునకు నిషేధము.

ఇట్లుండగా ద్విగువును స్త్రీలింగమున ప్రయోగించుట రుచిరము.

ఇది వైకల్పికత్వమున్నచోట. నిషేధస్థానమున కాదు.

పంచమాజీ - దశరథీ.

ఇట్లు తత్పురషను నపుంసకిముగా చేయుట ఇష్టమట (6.38).

#### 5. కారకము

తృతీయ కర్తృకరణములకే పాణిని (2.3.18) విధింపగా వార్తికకారుడు ప్రకృత్యాదులకు విధించుటనుబట్టి భామహుడు

ఇయం చంద్రముఖీ కన్యా ప్రకృత్యైవ మనోహరా (6.30)

అని వ్రాసెను పాణిని - వార్తికకార - మహాభాష్యకారుల సనుసరించి ఈ యధ్యాయముల్లు వివేచించినాడు భామహుడు. పాణిని చెప్పకున్నాను వార్తిక - మహాభాష్యములు చెప్పినచో గ్రాహ్యమేనన్న భామహుని అభిప్రాయమును పై శ్లోకము సూచించును

కావ్యమలౌకికరసానుభూతికి హేతువు. ఆ విచిత్రానుభూతినే భామహుడు వక్రత అన్నాడు ఏ శబ్దము దానిని కల్గించునో అది వక్రోక్తి. సాలాతురీయ - తిష్ఠద్గు - వహద్గు వంటివిట్టివే. ఈ వక్రత చిత్రచిత్రముగ అంచెలకొలది యుండును. సమాసాలు - సంధులు నిరూపించుటలో భామహుడు శ్రవణసౌభాగ్యమునే దృష్టిలో పెడుకొనెను అలంకార విషయాది వక్రతానిరూపణమున వక్రత ఉచ్చస్థాయికి చెందినది. అది మానసిక - తదధిక దశకు చెందినది. ఈ యంచెలు స్థాయిభేదాలు - భావనాయోగ్యములని భామహుని నిరూపణ.

ఋజుశబ్దము ఋజుదృష్టివంటిది. వక్రోక్తి కటాక్షమువంటిది. అది వాచ్యార్థనివే దకము, వార్త, వ్యావహారికము.

శబ్దస్పష్టార్థే కా హృద్యతా. (లోచనము - బాలప్రియ, పు. 528)

కటాక్షము పరస్పర హృదయ మాధుర్య వ్యంజకమై దేశకాలవ్యక్తి విభేదము లను తూల్చి పరస్పర విలీనతకు హేతువగును<sup>1</sup>.

కావ్యహృదయసమున్మీలన సామర్థ్యము వక్రోక్తికే కలదు. కేవల ఋజుత

1. "The union and interaction of individuals are based upon mutual glances. The mutual glance between persons, as distinguished from the sight or observation of the other signifies a wholly new and unique union between them. The significant fact here is that the glance by which one seeks to perceive the other itself, one discloses one self. By the same act in which the observer seeks to know the observed, he surrenders himself to be understood by the observer."

(Krishna Chaitanya : *Sanskrit Poetics*, p. 11 తా Simmel వాగ్మితగా సమాదితము.)

2. The straight line offers a curious object for analysis. It is not for the eye a very easy form to grasp. We bend it or leave it. Unless it passes through the centre of vision it is obviously a tangent to the point which passes through the relations to the centre. The local signs or tensions of the points in such a tangent vary in an un-seizable progression, there is violence in keeping to it; and the effect is forced. This makes the dry and stiff quality of any long straight line which the skilful Greeks avoided by the curves of their columns and entablatures and the less economical barbarians by a profusion of interruptions and ornaments. (Sense of Beauty, p. 69)

ఇది భారతీయ సంప్రదాయమును. ఇచ్చటి శిల్పచిత్రక కాసాందర్యమంతయు నిట్టిదే. ఈ వక్రలతావలయము సాందర్యవ్యంజకమనుట గ్రీకుసాంప్రదాయము. అంతే కాక జగత్కావ్యశక్తికి వ్యంజకమనుట భారతీయ సంప్రదాయము, స్పృహ దేవాలయాదు లందలి పై లతావలయాదికము జగత్ స్పందశక్తికి వ్యంజకము. బాప్టాన్ బౌద్ధస్తూప మందలి లతావలయములు బుద్ధుని జన్మపరంపరకు నిదానము (symbol) చూ. *Indian Sculpture - Stellar Kramarisch*)

సరళరేఖ వంటిది. వక్రక్రి, వక్రరేఖ - లతావలయములు (curves) ఇది ప్రతిభావి నిస్సూతము. వస్తువునందు సహజముగా వైచిత్రి యుండదు ఉన్న యుండమును చాకిరి చే.

“The beauty of material is thus the ground work of all higher beauty, both in the object, whose form and meaning have to be lodged in some thing sensible and in the mind where sensuous ideas being the first to emerge and the first that can arouse delight.”

(Sense of Beauty, p 62)

కావ్యసౌందర్యము వేఱు, లోకసౌందర్యము వేఱు. అది ఉక్తివైచిత్ర్యనే సంపాద్యము. ఇది లేనిచో వస్తువు నవీకృతము కాదు.

“ఉక్తివైచిత్ర్యేణ తు త ఏవార్థ నిరవధయో భవంతీతి

తద్విషయాణాం ప్రతిభాన మానంత్య ముపపన్న చితి.”

నను ప్రతిభావంతస్య కిం ఫలమితి నిర్ణేతుం వాణి నవత్సమాయాతి.

(లోచనము-చాంద్రియ, పు. 122.)

అతథాస్థితానపి తథాసంస్థితాని హృదయే యా నివేశయతి

అప్రవిశేషాన్ సా జయతి ఏకటపిగోచరా వాణి (సై.లో. 4.4)

అభినవుల ఉక్తివైచిత్ర్యి, అనందవర్జనుల వికటవాణి వక్రక్రియే.

వార్తచే కవి కావ్యమున, తదర్థమున తన్మయీభవనము కుడుచు, కాగా చాంద్రియ దోషము సంభవించును.

1. రసవత్త్వైష్యపేళలమ్, భామహ. 6.12

2. యత్ర దృష్టాంతమాత్రేణ వ్యఖ్యేతే సాధ్యసాధనే, 6.13.

3 కథమేకపదేనైవ వ్యఖ్యేన్నస్య తే గుణాః, 6.14.

1. కావ్యము రసవత్తరమయ్య (కపిత్థోపమానము కారాదు)

2. కేవల దృష్టాంతమాత్రముచే సాధ్యసాధనము వ్యంజించుచుచో (ఉత్త దృష్టాంతము.)

3. (విస్తరభీరులైన కవులు) ఏకపదముచే ననంతార్థము వ్యంజించుట ఎట్లాయని యోచించి యట్లు వ్రాయుదురు

ఈ సందర్భములందలి పై గీట్లుగీచిన మాటలు వ్యంగ్యవిషయమునే సూచించుచు వక్రక్రికి పర్యాయపదాలుగా భామహుడు వాడినట్లు కన్పించుచున్నది. అనిగా నీవిధికి భర్తవి

వాదమస్ఫుటముగా స్ఫురించినది. ధ్వని రామణీయకచ్ఛాయలిందున్నది. 5.62 లోని రస శబ్దము వక్రతార్థమున వాదబడినది. రసవదలంకారమే రసముగా పేర్కొనినవాడిచట నిట్లు వ్రాయుటచే వక్రతయే రసమనవచ్చును.

వక్రోక్తి అర్థవిభావనయోగ్య శబ్దము. అర్థము రసము - వక్రత, విషయము - శబ్దము రెంటియందును వక్రతయుండుటనగా కవిప్రతీభావినిర్మాణమన్నమాటయే. ఇందు చేతనే తన గ్రంథమును ప్రారంభించుచునే ఆచార్యుడు

‘కావ్యం తు జాయతే జాతు కన్యచిత్ ప్రతిభావతః’ 1.5.

అని కవిప్రతిభకు కర్పూరహారతి పట్టినాడు.

## OUR CONTRIBUTORS

1. Dr. Moti Lal Rastogi      Lecturer in Sanskrit,  
Lucknow University,  
Lucknow.
2. Dr. S.S. Raghavachar      Professor of Philosophy,  
Manasagangothri,  
Mysore University,  
Mysore.
3. Sri N. Subramania Sastri      Formerly Curator,  
S.V. University Oriental Research  
Institute Manuscripts Library,  
Tirupati.
4. Sri V.S. Kambi      Research Assistant in Viraśaiva  
Literature,  
Department of Kannada,  
Karnatak University,  
Dharwar-3.
5. Dr. D.N. Sukla      Professor & Head of the Department  
of Sanskrit,  
Punjab University,  
Chandigarh.
6. Dr. Ramesh Sundarji Betai      Reader in Sanskrit,  
Gujarat University,  
Ahmedabad.
7. Dr. N. Subbu Reddiar      Reader & Head of the Department  
of Tamil,  
S.V. University,  
Tirupati.
8. Dr. (Miss) Aparna Chatto-  
padhyay      Lecturer in History,  
Banaras Hindu University,  
Varanasi-5.
9. Dr. V. Krishnaswamy Iyengar      Reader,  
Central Hindi Institute,  
Agra-5.
10. Dr. Kishor Nath Jha      Senior Research Fellow,  
Kameswara Simha Durbhanga San-  
skrit University,  
Durbhanga.
11. Dr. Biswanath Battacharya      Lecturer in Sanskrit,  
Viswabharati University,  
Santiniketan.
12. Dr. T. Koteswara Rao      Lecturer in Telugu,  
S.V. University,  
Tirupati.









नारायणकविविरचितः

कमलाविलासभाणः

# KAMALAVILASABHANA

*By*

NĀRĀYANAKAVI

*Edited with Introduction*

*By*

**Dr. K.S. RAMAMURTI, M.A., Ph.D.**

*Lecturer in Sanskrit, S.V.U.O.R. Institute.*

**SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY**

**ORIENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE**

**TIRUPATI**

**1971**



## FOREWORD

The S. V. University Oriental Research Institute Manuscripts Library has a collection of more than 15,000 Sanskrit and Telugu manuscripts covering almost all the branches of knowledge in Indian Culture. While sizable works among them are being published as independent works under S.V. University Oriental Series, some of the smaller but yet rare and interesting works could not be ignored. So a new feature of publishing such manuscripts is introduced in 1968 which forms an appendage to S.V U. Oriental Journal in the name of 'Texts and Studies'. Under that item *Gajagrahaṇaprakāra* was issued as No. 1 appended to Vol. VII and *Apāṇiniyaprāmāṇyasādhana* as No. 2 appended to Vol. VIII of the Journal.

The present work *Kamalāvilāsabhāṇa* is being issued as No. 3 under 'Texts and Studies'. This is a critical edition of a *Bhāṇa* written by Nārāyaṇakavi who is supposed to have flourished in the earlier half of the eighteenth century. The merits of this work have been very well brought out by the Editor himself. Works of this class may appear as very vulgar in expressions if translated into any regional language but yet they command the approbation of scholarly public because of the lucid and chaste language used in them.

TIRUPATI, }  
Dt. 31—7—1971. }

J. CHENNA REDDY,  
GENERAL EDITOR.



## INTRODUCTION

The *Bhāṇa* is one of the ten types of the major dramatic compositions in Sanskrit.<sup>1</sup> This is a one Act play and an artistic monologue. Only one character appears on the stage throughout supplying the place of interlocutors by means of copious use of *ākāśabhāṣita* (voice in air), i.e. the actor enters into an imaginary conversation with the other unseen characters by repeating their speeches and himself answering them.

The *Daśarūpaka* defines the *Bhāṇa* as a one Act play. The hero a *Viṭa* (usually a helper of the hero in his love affairs in a play like *Nāṭaka*) either narrates his own story or the story of others like a thief or gambler etc. The conversations are in the form of interrogations and answers with the aid of *ākāśabhāṣita*. The sentiment is either *śṛṅgāra* or *vīra* and the plot is a *kalpita*. There are only *mukha* and *nirvaṇa* junctures and the *vṛtti* is *bhāratī*.<sup>2</sup> The *Sāhityadarpaṇa* also gives the same definition. But in the case of *vṛtti* it says that the *bhāratī* is often found.<sup>3</sup> The word 'often' (प्रायेण) means that the *kaiśikīvṛtti* also is found rarely.<sup>4</sup> The *bhāratīvṛtti* is nothing but the Sanskrit style of speech adopted by the actor.<sup>5</sup>

*Viṭa* is a person adept in one branch of learning.<sup>6</sup> which is explained as the branch like music etc., which is useful in helping the hero.<sup>7</sup> But the *Sāhityadarpaṇa* depicting him as a good conversationalist with charming manners makes him a sexually in potent person.<sup>8</sup> Quite contrary to this we find the *Viṭa* in this play loved and selected as a partner in love by the harlot.

1. नाटकं सप्रकरणं भाणः प्रहसनं विमः ।

व्यायोगसमवाकरौ वीथ्यङ्केहामृगा दश ॥ *Pratāparudrīyam*, III. 2.

2. *Daśarūpaka*, III. 49-51, Adyar Ed.

3. वृत्तिः प्रायेण भारती । *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, VI. 230, Kane's Ed.

4. प्रायेण भारती, क्वापि कैशिक्यपि वृत्तिर्भवति । *ibid.* Chapt. VI. p. 98.

5. भारती संस्कृतप्रायो वाग्व्यापारो नटाश्रयः । *Daśarūpaka*, III. 5.

6. एकविद्यो विटः । *ibid.* III. 9.

7. गीतादिविद्यानां नायकोपयोगिनीनां एकस्या विद्याया वेदिता । *ibid.* page. 158.

8. संभोगहीनसंपादितस्तु धूर्तः कलैकदेशज्ञः ।

वेशोपचारकुशलो वाग्मी मधुरोऽथ बहुमतो गोष्ठ्याम् ॥ *Sāhityadarpaṇa*, III. 41.



The word *bhāṇa*, according to Dhanika is formed by the first and last letters of the word *Bhārativṛtti-pradhāna*,<sup>1</sup> a *vṛtti* which is usually found in this type of play. But to Abhinavagupta the *Bhāṇa* takes its origin from the root *bhaṇ*, 'to speak', as it is only one character that is made to speak through out the play.<sup>2</sup> Though these two appear to be different, they are in fact identical in their import as the *bhārativṛtti* is nothing but the verbal expression in a play.

Though the *śṛṅgāra* and *vīra* sentiments are allowed, the *Bhāṇas* usually abound in *śṛṅgāra* only. The *Bhāṇas* with the sentiment *vīra* are yet to come to light. The comic element, i.e. *hāsyā* is only a subordinate to the main sentiment.

Nārāyaṇa Kavi is the author of the *Kamalāvilāsabhāṇa* which is also known as the *Ramāvilāsabhāṇa*. His other work is a drama titled *Pādukāpctṭābhīṣeka* in six acts. We understand from these two plays that he was a native of Anantakṛṣṇapura of the Tanjore district. He was the son of Śrīnivāsasūri and studied under Veṅkaṭaraṅgaṇātha.

Excepting these facts that he was a scholar and a poet no other information about him is traceable. His works are not noticed in any one of the existing catalogues. As the *Bhāṇas* in Sanskrit are abundantly written in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Nārāyaṇa also must have flourished in between these centuries.

### The Theme

The theme is very simple. The play as usual opens with a prologue in which an account of the poet and the season are given. The place of the action is near about Mīnākṣīpura where connoisseurs of all types gathered for the Chaitra festival of Rāmānuja.

After the *Prastāvana* Rasikaśekhara, the hero, starts the action with his appreciation of the skill of a certain harlot whom he enjoyed the previous night, in the science of erotics. He then announces that he started to attend the marriage celebrations of the daughter of Kādambarī in the early hours of the day, on her invitation. On his way he sees the beautifully decorated house of Kāmamañjarī as suited to the spring-season and informs Śārikā that he could not meet her for a long time as he was heavily preoccupied. Then, going a few steps further he observes that his friend Vasantasena talking to the youthful Kanaka-

1. भारतीयवृत्तिप्रधानत्वात् भाणः *Daśarūpaka*, p. 138.

2. एकमुखेनैव भण्यन्ते उक्तिमन्तः क्रियन्ते । अग्रविष्टा अपि पात्रविशेषा यत्रेति भाणः ।

mañjarī (Anāṅgamañjarī) abandoning her mother Kāmamañjarī and congratulates him on his sagacity in obtaining her with very little effort. Now he encounters the charming Puṣpavāṭikā playing on her lute and praises her beautiful form and music. Next he comes across Madana-mālinī and expresses his desire to enjoy her. But on hearing that Madhuketu was engaged inside he censures the mentality of the mothers of the prostitutes who show more respect for the rich though unmatching ignoring the promising youth. At this stage he observes Candrasena being threatened by the old mother of Sundaralātā. On enquiry he learns the cause that his friend Candrasena executed a contract with this strumpet for one year but the old mother made the girl over to another person in his absence. After effecting a compromise between them, he again on his way knows that Śūrasena and Virasena are fighting for the sake of Mādhavī. Hence he proceeds to the spot where Śūrasena complained to him that he gave one hundred rupees to Mādhavī fixing up an engagement with her but Virasena enjoyed her by force before his arrival. He pacifies both and then finally proceeds to the house of Kādambarī. He describes the splendored decorations and other arrangements found at the premises of Kādambarī and the eagerness of the people assembled there for the hand of Kamalā. Having understood that they were all waiting only for him he takes his seat and his joy knew no bounds when he learns from Sālabhañjikā that he was selected by Kamalā for her partner. He congratulates himself and the play comes to an end with a benediction.

### Appraisal

The two works of Nārāyaṇa that have so far come to us show him as a trained scholar and a poet. His diction is elegant and is always unambiguous in expressions. The verse

त्वं मेति शब्दं न कुरु प्रमाणं सीत्कारगर्भं वचनं च तस्याः ।

अर्थान्तरे संक्रमितस्वभाव इशब्दो वधूना मिति हि प्रसिद्धिः ॥

does not only serve as an example for his clarity but also hints at his knowledge of rhetorics, reminding us of the *arthāntarasamkramita-vācya* variety of *dhvani*. The verse बाणान् पञ्चविसृज्य... (47) is an example of his fertile poetic thought and the verse सन्ध्या ताण्डवचातुरी.... (54) shows that he is capable of writing in flowing compounds. He reveals his keen observations by making striking generalizations such as कामिलोक एव सर्वथा विस्मरणशीलः ; चमत्कारिवचनचतुरः खलु कामिलोकः and कामिन्यर्थमेव प्रवर्तते कलहः.... etc.

There are also a few instances where Nārāyaṇa goes against the accepted canons of grammar etc. For example he uses अनुसार्यते (p. 4, l. 7) instead of अनुश्रियते. Again in the verse तन्वङ्गीयं (42) the word चेतः and its adjective सुकृती do not agree with each other as they belong to neuter and masculine genders. The authenticity of the word श्वश्रु in its shortened form in the compound श्वश्रुसुखा (verse 48) is also doubtful. In the matter of metre also he takes liberties. The words-like विधृतस्रगिमं (verse 42) and सुजातिस्रजं (verse 43) where a conjunct consonant like स्र alters the metre depending on the nature of pronunciation, which is usually not accepted in Sanskrit, are used.

The Lacuna suspected after the verse बहुधा तपांसि तप्त्वा (verse 30) might be scribal. As this play depicts the characters who are loose at heels the poet, from their stand-point, is justified in making statements like ब्रह्मानन्दसत्रस्रचारिण मानन्द मनुभवामि etc.

#### MS. material

There is only one MS. of this work in our Institute Library :-

Stock No.	...	794 (a)
Material	...	Palmleaf
Script	...	Grantha
Size	...	43 x 4.4. cms.
Folios	...	10
Lines	...	8
Letters	...	50
Condition	...	not bad.

As no other MS. of this work is available with any other MSS. Library I might have left certain things unnoticed for which I crave the indulgence of my readers. In this connection I also request them to correct the words सन्तर्हासं, भवद्भिः, अकाण्डो, विलिम्ब्यते and यतामः on pages 2 and 5 as सान्तर्हासं, भवद्भिः, अकाण्डे, विलिम्ब्यते and यतामहे respectively.

I now take this opportunity to thank my authorities of the S.V. University and my Director Prof. J. Chenna Reddy, M.A., Ph.D., for their valuable encouragement in bringing this small work into light.

K.S. RAMAMURTI,  
EDITOR.

## — पात्राणि —

१. सूत्रधारः

२. नटः

३. रमेशस्वरः

## — प्रतीयमानपात्राणि —

पुरुषाः	१२. काममञ्जरी
४. वसन्तसेनः	१३. कनकमञ्जरी
५. मधुकेतुः	१४. पुष्पवाटिका
६. चन्द्रसेनः	१५. मदनमालिनी
७. शूरसेनः	१६. वृद्धवारविलासिनी
८. वीरसेनः	१७. सुन्दरलता
स्त्रियः	१८. रत्नवल्लरी
९. कादम्बरी	१९. माधवी
१०. कमला	२०. सालभञ्जिका
११. शारिका	



॥ श्री गणेशाय नमः ॥

## कमलाविलासभागः

मम मनसि किमपि विपुले  
भजतां सर्वत्र मुत्तरं ज्योतिः ।  
लक्ष्म्यालिङ्गितगतं  
भातुतमां धूर्तकुलधुर्यम् ॥

१

अपि च,

नीले केशभरे सुशोभनतरे मुह्यत्यदो मे मन-  
स्त्वद्वक्षोजरथाङ्गयोश्च हृदयानन्दैकसन्दोहयोः ।  
ते पद्मे नयने कृताभिरुचिराकण्टं न शक्ताऽस्म्यपी-  
त्येवं जारशिरोमणे र्यदुपते धूर्तत्व मव्याद् विभोः ॥

२

(नान्द्यन्ते)

सूत्रधारः— (सर्वतोऽवलोक्य, सविनयं, सामाजिकानुद्दिश्य भोः भोः स्मानजिकाः  
निस्समाभ्यधिकानि मधुराणि च रूपकाणि बहूनि दृष्टानि तत्रभवद्भिः ।  
तथापि तत्रभवतां सन्निधौ सफलयिष्यामो वयं कुलक्रमागतां भरतशास्त्र-  
नैपुणीम् । स्वभावः खल्वयं लोकानाम् ।

आरूढाण्डजनायकमध्युषिताहीशभोगशय्य मपि ।

रघुपति मुदवह दखिले प्वनिलसुतः प्रार्थनाभि रुचिताभिः ॥

३

(आकाशे कर्णं दत्त्वा)

किं व्रूथ ! भो भरतपुत्र ! अल मल मौपचारिकेन वचनेन । भवता करिष्य-  
माणस्य रूपकस्यावलुलोकिष्यैव समागता वयम् । अहह ! कुशलः खलु भवान् ।  
(इति सन्नर्हासं) तत्र भवाद्विः सम्यगवेक्षिताना मियं कियती कुशलता । तथा हि —

सर्वाऽप्याश्रयसंपदा विजयते प्रौढोऽपि हीनोऽपि वा  
जीवो नित्यतयाश्रुतो विभु रिति प्रख्यातभूमोदयः ।  
प्राप्तो ब्राह्मणकाय मुज्ज्वलतरं सर्वेषु कर्म स्वयं  
योग्यः , कर्मवहिष्कृतो भवति यश्चण्डालकायं गतः ॥

४

(नेपथ्ये)

आरूढयौवनेयं शनैः स्मरारूढमाधवा तन्वी ।  
परिरब्धुं यतमाना मुग्धेव विभाति मालती दयितम् ॥

५

(सानन्दम्)

भाव ! प्रकृतार्थमूचना न्माननीयोऽसि । तथापि मालतीति स्थाने कमलेति  
संघटनीयम् । भव त्वित स्तावत् ।

(प्रविश्य)

नटः— मारिष ! अनुयोजय न्त्यार्यमिश्राः प्रयोक्ष्यमाणं रूपकं कीदृशनामधेय मिति ।

सूत्रः— भाव ! अवहितेन विज्ञापयितव्यं तत्रभवतां सकाशे । यतः —

निर्वर्तितशास्त्राणां सरसां कवितां प्रहर्षयन्तितराम् ।  
विदुषा मयं समाजः प्रसेदुषां विदितभरतविद्यानाम् ॥

६

नटः— अथ किम् ।

सूत्रः— भो स्सामाजिकाः ! इयं विज्ञप्तिः —

अधिवसति यत्र मण्डल मुद्गण्डानां प्रचण्डविद्यानाम् ।  
तादृशमहिमा ग्रामो ह्यनन्तकृष्णापुराभिधः पाण्ड्ये ॥

७

तत्र च भरद्वाजकुलजलधिपारिजातस्य श्रीसारनाथदिव्यकटाक्षलब्धमार्गवज्ञकीर्तिमुख-

त्रमस्तवैभवश्रीवेङ्कटेशदेशिकमणिसानुकम्पापाङ्गकल्पपादपवदान्यतानिदर्शकस्य श्री श्रीनि-  
वाससूरीश्वरस्यौरस स्तनयः । यश्च —

श्रीमतो वेङ्कटाधीशरङ्गनाथगुरो गिरः ।

अनिशं चिन्तय वास्ते सुधातो रसवत्तराः ॥

८

अपि च —

स्वयं विनीत स्सुगुणैकभूषण स्तथापि नारायणनामभूषितः ।

चकार भाणं हृदयङ्गमं सतां रमाविलासाभिध मेष नूतनम् ॥ ९

किं ब्रूय ! भवता प्रतिज्ञातस्य कस्य वा कुत्र रसास्वादने प्रतिरोधः । किं पुना  
रसवत्तरूपकाभिनयग्रहणे इति ।

पुरस्कृतयुष्मदनुग्रहाणा मस्माकं क्व वान्यूनता । किं पुन स्तत्रभवतां सन्निधौ  
(पुरोऽवलोक्य) अहह ! किमिदं नातिदूरतो दृश्यते सात्त्विकजनभूयिष्ठं विटकुल-  
सम्मिलितं श्रीवैष्णवकुलम् । इत इतः —

मीनाक्षीपुरवासी सुव्रज्जण्योऽद्य गीतिपारज्ञः ।

रसिककुलचित्तहारी रञ्जयति मनो रसज्ञानाम् ॥ १०

भाव ! इत इतो दीयतां दृष्टिः । अद्य पुनः सन्निहिते नगरे श्रीमद्वेदान्तसारभूत  
श्री शारीरकसूत्रतत्त्वार्थप्रतिपादनलब्धसार्वज्ञकीर्तेः, दुर्वादिगर्वसर्वङ्कषस्य श्रीमतो  
रामानुजयतिसार्वभौमस्य चैत्रोत्सवसंभ्रमे —

प्रतिदेशमुपागता रसज्ञा

रतितन्त्रार्थविचारचारुदक्षाः ।

रतिनायकवेदवावदूका-

स्समवेता इह पुण्यसन्तते मे ॥ ११

(अन्यतो दृष्ट्वा वसन्तातिशयं निर्वर्ण्य सश्लाघं)

मलयपवनो मन्दं मन्दं मरन्द मयं शिवन्

विरचितगतिः प्रीत र्श्शते लताभवनोदरे ।

सुस्तजनितं खेदं छिन्दन् कुरङ्गदृशां स्वयं

हरति हृदयं लीलालोली ममोत्सुकचेतसः ॥

१२



अपि च —

वासन्तीं प्रथमं करै रनुनयन् कौन्दीं दृशाऽऽलोकयन्  
सौवर्णीं सुपलालयन् सुवचसा ता त्रागवल्लीं स्मृशन् ।  
सम्भोगं कुरुतेऽद्य कल्पलतया मन्दो मरुत्तल्लजो  
मानुष्यं शठभाव मप्य य महो पश्यातिशेते स्वयम् ॥

१३

(नट :- आरूढयौवनेय मित्यादि पुनः पठति)

मूत्र :- अहो ! विस्मृतप्रस्तुतकृत्येन मया प्रसक्त मेवानुसार्यते । तत् भाव ! रस-  
शेखरवेषधारिणा भगिनीपतिना कमलाविवाहोत्सवः करिष्यते । मयापि  
तत्सहायवेषधारिणा भवितव्यम् । (इति निष्क्रान्तौ)

— प्रस्तावना —

(ततः प्रविशति रसशेखरः)

रसशेखरः — अहह ! सर्वधा प्रमुग्धोऽस्मि । तथा हि —

रात्रौ तया तरलकुण्डलया निकामं  
निष्पीडिताङ्गवितति स्सुखवासभूमिः ।  
सोऽहं यथाभिलषितं रममाणचेताः  
निद्राप्रमुग्धहृदयोऽद्य परं प्रबुद्धः ॥

१४

अहह ! किमुच्यते तस्याः कामशास्त्रकौशलम् —

मुक्ताभूषितचन्द्रबिम्ब मुदयद्वावल्यबिम्बाञ्चला-  
न्निर्गच्छ न्मलयानिलं समुदय न्मञ्जुस्वनं सर्वदा ।  
मीलन्नीलसरोरुहं मणियुतादर्शं मृणालाञ्चित-  
ग्रीवं तत् पुरुषायितं पुनरपि ध्यायामि तस्या मुहुः ॥

१५

अपि च —

शय्यायां सहसा निपात्य दयिता हस्ताम्बुजाभ्यां क्षणा-  
दारुह्योरसि 'रे शठासि विधिना कामेन च ज्ञापितः ।  
अद्यत्वं किमु मोक्ष्यसे जड जडे' त्येवं दुदोह स्वयं  
ब्रह्मानन्दसमान मान्तरसुखं दोग्ध्रीव दिव्या मम ॥

१६

(दक्षिणाक्षिस्पन्द मभिनीय)

अहो किमिदं मकाण्डो प्रसक्तो दक्षिणस्य नयनस्य स्पन्दः । (सानुस्सरणम्) अहो ज्ञातम् । किमद्य मयैवं विलिम्ब्यते । कादम्बरीदुहितुः कमलायाः परेद्युः न्वयं-वरोत्सवः करिष्यत इति पूर्वेषु रेव तथा प्रेषिता मत्सकाशे पत्रिका । तदर्थं मेवोषमि मया प्रस्थितम् । तथापि विस्मृतवा नस्मि । अथ वा कामिलोक एव सर्वदिस्सरण-शीलः । तथा हि —

अधरीकृतसर्ववस्तुजातं सुरतान्तेह्यनु भूयमान मेदम् ।

सरता कतमेन वा सुखान्ता न विलीनं तमसि प्रमोहरूपे ॥ १७

भवतु प्रस्तुतं यतामः । (इति कनकवेत्रलता मुत्काम्य) अहो ! असा बुदयगिरि-शिखर मधिरूढो भगवा न्मरीचिमाली । तथा हि —

गिरा वस्मि न्नेता शिखरदिगवच्छन्नकुहरे

विहारं कुर्वत्यो विवसनतया मत्तहृदयाः ।

सलज्जाका स्सूर्योद्गतकिरणसङ्गेन नितरां

प्रधावन्ति स्वैरं विलुलितकचं देववनिताः ॥

१८

अहो ! धृष्टनायकानुकर मंशुमालिनः !

प्राचीवासकसज्जिका मुपचरन् तै स्तै विशेषैः क्रमात्

आलिङ्गन् दिवसश्रियं किल करा न्विस्तार्य तां खण्डिताम् ।

बालां सम्य गवेक्ष्य वासरपति स्त्वम्भोजिनीं रागिणी-

मारूढप्रथमानुरागसुभग स्सोल्लास मालोकते ॥

१९

(अन्यतोविलोक्य)

अहो ! वसन्तस्य निरतिशयो महिमा । एकत्र मधुमाधुरीधुरीणमधुकरीशंकृति-निरन्तरः शुक्लदत्तफलकदम्बकोन्मत्तशारिकामधुरशब्दमधुरः इत इतो वसन्तस्याति-शयः । तथाहि —

चूत स्सूचयतीव मन्मथशस्प्रस्ताव मुत्कोकिल-

शशोण शशोचयतीव पान्थनिवहं कङ्कलितवर्गः परम् ।

कामः प्रीणयतीव पुष्पनिवहैः कान्तां रतिं निस्तुलैः

तारं ताडयतीव तारनिनदां भेरीं मरुद्वल्लभः ॥

२०

(स्पर्शसुख मभिनीय, सहर्षसंभ्रमं)

भो ! मलयपवन !

नोपकृतं त्वद्विषये नापकृतञ्चापि मानुषेण मया ।

कथमिव जनयसि सहिते तथैव रहिते सुखञ्च दुःखञ्च ॥

२१

(पदान्तरं गत्वा)

इयं पुनर्निखिलसुरासुरातिशायिवैभवस्य, भगवत शशम्बरवैरिणः निरतिशयोत्सवसंभ्रान्त-  
वाराङ्गनासमादेशकरणचट्टलविटनिकरगतागतदुष्करप्रवेशा, सौवर्णरम्भालङ्कृतासु मर-  
कतादिरत्नखचितासु ज्योतिर्मयीषु स्तम्भाग्रभागविहरमाणकोकिलालापमधुरासु बहिर्वेदि-  
कासु अनुभूतसुरतोत्सवसुखैर्निद्रावशेषशोणीकृतनयनै रालस्यमात्रविश्रान्तावयवैः पौनः  
पुन्येन चर्च्यमाणवीटीकैः पीठमर्दविटचेटविदूषकप्रायै रधुषितास्तरणा, काममञ्जर्यादि-  
भवनालङ्कृता, कादम्बरीभवनस्य मार्गभूता, वसन्तवीथिका वेशवाटिका ;

(पुरोऽवलोक्य)

अये ! सुभ्रू रियं सौधान्तराल मध्यास्ते । इयं हि —

उपभोगखिन्नशुभकायसंपदा

सुविराजते नयनमोददायिनी ।

स्फुरिता विधो रिव कलावशेषिता

कलये न्न कस्य मनसो मुदं द्रुतम् ॥

२२

(उपसृत्य)

किं ब्रवीषि ? भाव कुत्र जिगमिषेति । सखि ! शारिके ! त्वद्दर्शना दृते किमस्ति  
मादृशानां जनानाम् । किं ब्रवीषि ? चमत्कारिवचनचतुरः खलु कामिलोकः ,  
तथाऽप्यमुष्मिन् दिवसे मदीयं भवन मलङ्करोतु भाव इति । सखि ! तदेतत् भवतु ।  
एत दुच्यताम् —

बिम्बं धवलमिहसहितं म्लानं नीलोत्पलद्वन्द्वम् ।

मणिगणखचितौ मुकुरौ महिमानं कस्य वा प्रशंसन्ति ॥

२३

किं ब्रवीषि ? किमनेन नर्मवचनेनेति । सखि ! कालान्तरे भव त्वावयो मसँल्लापः ।  
कादम्बर्याः दुहितुः स्वयंवराथं प्रेषिता पत्रिका । आस्र,

(इत्यन्यतो गत्वा पुरोऽवलोक्य सकौतुकं)

कति कति वा न सन्ति भुवि कामिनीरूपाणि रत्नानि । हा मनोहारिणीयं प्रियसखी ।

दन्ताभै नखराङ्कुरै विलुलितान् निर्माचयन्त्यालका-

स्तन्वङ्गथा हृदयं मदीय मधुना चेतोभुवा दर्शितम् ।

केशग्राह मिदं हृतं कि मथवा चोरेण तेनान्यथा

गूढे तन्निहितं क वाणु सदृशं हर्तुं क ईप्सते स्वयम् ॥

२४

सखि ! मनोहारिणि ! अन्वर्थसंज्ञया भवत्या कुत्र निक्षिप्तं मदीयं चेतः । किमर्थं मयं  
तूष्णींभावः । किं ब्रवीषि ! मादृशा स्तत्कालमात्रप्रयोजना जनाः । किमद्य मया  
वक्तव्यम् ; इति । सखि ! किं मेव मुच्यते । शपामि ते मप्रणयेन गाढोपगूढ-  
महोत्सवेन । पुरा किल कार्यान्तरव्यग्रेण मया न समागतं यथेप्सितं निर्वर्तयावः ,  
आस्र,

(इत्यन्यतो दृष्ट्वा)

अहहोऽस्मत् प्रियसखो वसन्तसेनः । काममञ्जरीं विहाय तद्दहित्रा कनकमञ्जर्या सह  
सँल्लपति । रसिकः खलु वसन्तसेनः । तस्यां वि --

सन्नाहं विवृणोति भाविन मिदं वक्षोजयुग्मं पुन

श्चातुर्यं मदनागमेषु नितरां श्यामा च रोमावलिः ।

सँल्लापा मधुरा स्सुधामपि तिरस्कुर्वन्ति बाल्योचिताः

वर्ण्येतेय मनङ्गजीवयितृका केनापि यूना बधूः ॥

२५

(समीपतः परिक्रम्य)

सखे ! वसन्तसेन ! रसिकजनवरेण्यो भवान् ; यतः गन्त्रीं छायां परित्यज्य गामिनी-  
छायैवानुरुद्धा भवता ।

(अपवार्य)

सखे ! कानि कानि सुखानि अनुभवसि तत्त्वतः कथय । किं ब्रवीषि ? 'भाव !  
किमु वक्तव्यम् ! आनन्दनिप्यन्दिकेव अनङ्गपताकिकेव इय मनङ्गमञ्जरी (कनक-

मञ्जरी) । तथापि लज्जाविजितमन्मथा भवति । भवतु तस्या स्सुभगङ्करं दर्शनं मेव पर्याप्तम् ।' इति । सुखे ! वसन्तसेन उपदिशामि भूतार्थम् —

त्व म्मेति शब्दं न कुरुप्रमाणं सीत्कारगर्भं वचनं च तस्याः ।

अर्थान्तरे संक्रमितस्वभाव इशब्दो वधूना मिति हि प्रसिद्धिः ॥ २६

किं ब्रवीषि ? “य दुपदिष्टं भावेने”ति । (आत्मगतं) किंचि देनं परिहसिष्यामि । (इति परिक्रम्य, प्रकाशं) सखे ! वसन्तसेन !

लोके ये द्रविणव्ययं समधिकं कृत्वा शरीरक्लमं

संपाद्याऽऽदधते भविष्यति सुखं कायान्त इत्यादरात् ।

ते कार्यं न विजानते य दधुनाऽऽधानं तवाल्पव्ययं

कायक्लेशविनाकृतं वितनुते सद्यः सुखं निस्तुलम् ॥

२७

किं बहुना, त दिह यज्ञं बहुद्रव्यव्ययसाध्यं वितन्वते भवद्वंश्या स्तादृशः कुलाचारोऽप्यद्य न विसृज्यते भवता । अहह किमुच्यते कुलाचारनिर्वहणं भवतः । तथा हि —

शय्यायां यज्ञभूमौ परिचरणजनैर्हंतृभिर्भूषितायां

कामाग्नौ दीप्यमाने युवतिकुलतनूवेदिकामध्यग स्त्वम् ।

रेतांस्यग्नौ हवींषि स्वय मिह मणितध्वानमन्त्रप्रभावो

दीक्षाकारी जुहोषी त्यनवरत महो धन्यधन्यः कुलीनः ॥

२८

तथापि यज्ञदीक्षित-कामदीक्षितयो रियान् विशेषः — एक स्सन्दिग्धदूरफलः, अन्यो निश्चितसद्यःफल इति । किं ब्रवीषि ? “भाव ! भवादृशानां रसज्ञाना मेव रसिक-जनकृत्ये अभिनिवेश इति । (स्वगतं) । अरे मूढ ! त्वत्तः को वाऽन्यो रसिको भूमौ विराजते । (प्रकाशं) । सखे ! कुत्र जिगमिषसि ? अहं तावत् कनकमञ्जर्या सह सल्लप्य किंचिदात्मानं कृतार्थयिष्ये । (उपसृत्य) सखि ! कनकमञ्जरि ! अनुरूप मेव पितरं पतिभावेनाधिगतासि ? किं ब्रवीषि सलज्जं ? भावस्यैव ईदृशेषु वचनेषु ईदृशी कुशलता” इति । सखि ! आवयो स्तुत्यसख्य मापन्नो वसन्तसेनः । त न्मदुत्सङ्ग उपविश । तत्प्रयुक्तां धन्यता मह मप्यनुभूयामि (साङ्गुतहर्ष)

वाराङ्गना मया दृष्टाः बह्वयः सौन्दर्यभूषिताः ।

सर्वातिशायि सौन्दर्यं केन सृष्ट मिदं भुवि ॥

२९

बहुधा तपांसि तप्त्वा शरदः कृच्छ्रेण शतसहस्रं मपि ।

सीत्कृतिनिषेधगर्भं नैव लभेत त्वदीयं सुपभांगम् ॥

३०

“भाव ! इदं कण्ठोपरिस्थं वचनं मेव । सर्वदा भावसमागम एव प्रतीक्ष्यते । कदा वा विधिर्घटयिष्यतीति तत् भाव एव जानाति”

(सन्निहितो भूत्वा चुबुकं मुञ्चमय्य)

सखि ! आवयो रूपभोगमहोत्सवे साहाय्यं माचरेदेव भगवान् पञ्चवाणः । आस्व,

(इत्यन्यतो दृष्ट्वा)

अहो भरतशास्त्रजलधिं मद्दृष्टचरपारं मापारं दृष्टवती पुष्पवाटिकां वीणां गानुं सुपक्रमते ।  
अहो सर्वत्रेयं वीथीं मनोहरा । तथा हि —

क्वचिन्नृत्तं गीतं क्वचिदपि जनाह्लादजनकं

शुक्लापाः क्वापि क्वचिदपि पिकानां विलसितम् ।

क्वचिन्मञ्जुध्वानः प्रसरति वधूनां कलकलः

क्वचिद्यूनां चित्तं हरति मधुवीथीयं मधुना ॥

३१

यावदनयापि सह संलप्य कालं यापयामि ।

(इति परिक्रम्य)

सखि ! पुष्पवाटिके ! प्रस्तूयतां तावद्द्वसन्तसमयं मुद्दिश्य गीतिः । किं ब्रवीषि ?  
“अपूर्वोऽयं भावसमागमः । इत आस्यताम्, चर्यतामिदं च ताम्बूलं” इति । भवतु,

(इति तथा कृत्वा)

सखि, उपक्रम्यतां पिपासते ते गीतिमाधुर्यं मदीयं मनः । किं ब्रवीषि ?

सो एव जअदि मअणो, माहप्पं जस्स जअदि लोएसु ।

सुउमारपुप्पवग्गो, जेण अणिच्चो सरत्तणेण किदो ॥

३२

(स एव जयति मदनो माहात्म्यं यस्य जयति लोकेषु ।

सुकुमारपुष्पवर्गो अनित्यं शशरत्नेन कृतः ॥)

अहो गीतस्य माधुर्यम् !

वीणानिनादैः शुकसारिकाणां पिकाङ्गनानां भ्रमराङ्गनानाम् ।

नादैर् मनोहारिभि रत्र तृप्तो नाहं यथा गीतिरसै स्त्वदीयैः ॥ ३३

सखि ! अन्यदा भव त्वावयो स्सँल्लापः । कादम्बर्या प्रेषिता पत्रिका । आस्व,

(इति परिक्रम्यान्यतोऽवलोक्य)

अहो मदनमालिनी गृहाङ्गणस्था वीथीं विलोकयन्ती तिष्ठति । अनया सँल्लपितु-  
मप्युत्कण्ठते चेतः । (उपसृत्य) सखि ! मदनमालिनि !

प्रत्युप्तस्तनमण्डलं प्रमथितान्योन्योदरं त्वा महं

बाहुभ्यां परिरभ्य तेऽधरपुटं निष्पीड्य बिम्बाधिकम् ।

उद्गच्छन्मलयानिलं परिसरन् मञ्जुस्वरं तावकं

संभोगं हृदयं ममाभिलषति प्रायेण सिध्ये दिदम् ॥ ३४

किं ब्रवीषि ? अये धूर्त, शनैर् ब्रूहि, अन्तरास्ते मधुकेतुः इति । अयि अव्यवस्थित-  
वृत्ते ! किं मलयकेतु निष्कासितः ? अथवा जननीपिशाच्यां जीवन्त्यां को वा दुर्लभो  
वारविलासिनीनाम् । तथा हि —

युवा तिष्ठ त्वग्रे गुणगणनिधि वर्तिमदनः

कुलीन श्रेष्ठो वा मदननिगमज्ञोऽपि ललितः ।

धनी य स्तं तै स्तै रुपचरति कामागमगतै-

विशेषै स्तारुण्यं विफलयति पुण्याः स्वजननी ॥ ३५

भवतु मदीयां प्रार्थनां निर्वर्तयस्व यावत्पश्यामि आस्व !

(इत्यन्यतो दृष्ट्वा, सभयहसितम्)

अये केयं पिशाचिकेव तर्जन्या तर्जयन्ती तिष्ठति (सर्वतो दृष्ट्वा) अहो चन्द्रसेनं  
निर्भर्त्सयति वृद्धवारविलासिनी । याव द्विचारयामि ।

(इति परिक्रम्य चन्द्रसेन मपवार्य)

सखे ! चन्द्रसेन ! किमर्थमेवं निर्भर्त्स्यसे ? किं ब्रवीषि ? अस्या जरठायाः पुत्रिकायै  
सुन्दरलतायै काञ्चित् पत्रिका मदाम् । एषा च रण्डा मां वञ्चयित्वा तदन्तराले युवान  
मन्यं प्रतिग्राहितवती । तदारभ्य न गतमेव मया न दत्तमपि किञ्चित् । तन्मूलकोऽयं

क्रोधः इति (विहस्य) अयि दुश्चेष्टिते ! तवैवाय मपराध इति प्रतिभाति । किं ब्रवीषि ? पत्रिका मवलोकयतु भाव — इति ।

(नाट्येन पत्रिकां गृहीत्वा वाचयति)

श्रीमति नन्दनहायने हेमन्तसमये अनन्तनगरवासी चन्द्रसेन सुन्दरलतायै कलत्रपत्र-  
मर्पयति । तत्प्रकारश्च ।

वर्षो मे नियमोऽस्तु; रूप्यशतकं शश्वत् दुकूलद्वयं  
दास्यामि प्रतिमास मद्भुततमं वीट्या शशतं नित्यशः ।  
एलाश्च क्रमुकाश्च तद्व दुपरि स्या दिच्छया मद्रुशे  
तिष्ठे च्चे दिय मन्यथा यदि न तत् किञ्चि न्मया दास्यते ॥ ३६

इति । भवतु, त्वत्तनया माह्वय (पुरोऽवलोक्य) सखि ! सुन्दरलते ! किं मीढशस्य  
कलहस्य निदान मासीः । भवतु । (अपवार्य) तिष्ठतु जननी —

वर्धतां प्रेम युवयो रन्योन्याभिनिविष्टयोः ।

मा यूय मङ्गीकुरुत जनन्या दुश्श्रवं वचः ॥

३७

सखि ! (अपवार्य) किं ब्रवीषि ? भाव ! एव मन्यैव रण्डया आचरितम् इति ।  
सखि भवतु वार्धकप्रयुक्त मेतत् । आध्वम्, (इत्यन्यत्र गत्वा सनिश्वासं) वृद्धवार-  
विलासिनीमुखा त्रिष्कान्तोऽस्मि । (आकाशे कर्णं दत्वा) कोऽयं कलकलः ? (इत्य-  
ग्रतो दृष्ट्वा) सखि ! रत्नवल्लरि ! कोऽयं कलकल इति किं मवगतं तत्रभवत्या । किं  
ब्रवीषि ? माधवीनिमित्तं शूरसेन-वीरसेनयोर्महान् कलहः । तदर्थं सर्वेऽपि  
जिगमिषन्ति इति । तर्हि मयापि गन्तव्यम् ।

(इति परिक्रम्य दृष्ट्वा साद्भुतम्)

अहो ! रामायणप्रसिद्धं दशग्रीव दशरथकुमारयोस्समर मप्यतिशेते समरमनयोः ।  
तथा हि —

मुष्टीमुष्टि विभिन्नबाहुलतिकौ तूष्णीं श्वसन्तौ क्षणात्  
उद्गच्छन्नयनस्कुलिङ्गनिवहैर्दन्दह्यमानाङ्गकौ ।  
केशाकेशि विभिन्नगलनिकटौ मल्लौ वृथा मानिनौ  
कुर्वन्ति विपुलं रणं कलुषितौ मत्तौ क्षणादूर्ध्वतः ॥

३८



अहो सर्वत्र कामिन्यर्थ मेव प्रवर्तते कलहः । तथाप्येतौ शान्तकलहौ चिकीर्षामि  
(इत्युपसृत्य) सखे ! शूरसेन ! इत आगम्यताम् । किं ब्रवीषि ? भाव ! किमर्थ-  
माह्वयत इति । सखे तवापि कथं मीदृशे कलहे प्रवृत्तिः । किं ब्रवीषि ? शृणोतु  
भावोऽस्य दरिद्रचूडामणे र्दस्युसार्वभौमस्य गर्वातिशयम् ।

दत्त्वा रूप्याणि शतं माधव्यै कमपि समय मुद्दिश्य ।

आयामीति मया गत मनेन भुक्ते बलात्कृत्य ॥

३९

तन्मूलोऽयं द्वेषः इति । रे वीरसेन इत स्त्व मायाहि — अतिक्रान्तमर्यादं दौर्जन्य-  
मद्यापि न विसृज्यते भवता । किं ब्रवीषि — अनेन पुन विंत्तमदेन मयि दोष स्समा-  
रोप्यते । अद्य चास्मदाचरणं भावो जानात्येव इति; तर्हि किमर्थं मिदं व्यर्थकर्मा-  
चरणम् । शान्तकलहौ भूयास्तम् । (इति परिक्रम्याग्रतो दृष्ट्वा सविस्मयम्) इमौ  
पुन स्तिर्यञ्चावपि मानुष मपि युद्ध मतिशयाते ताम्रचूडौ । तथा हि —

पादावाक्रम्य पादाभ्यां बद्धासिभ्या मिमौ मुहुः ।

पश्यतां नयनानन्दं कुर्वति समरोत्सवम् ॥

४०

(अन्यतो दृष्ट्वा परिक्रम्य साद्गुतहर्षसंभ्रमम्)

इदञ्च सर्वत्र कलकलायमानं स्वस्वकार्यव्यग्रिभिः परिचारिकाभि स्समुद्गीप्तधूपदीपादिजातं  
वारविलासिनीसमारब्धगीतिमाधुरीधुरीणमधुकरीझं कृतिनिरन्तरनागसरमृदङ्गजोषुप्यमाणं  
'वृणोतु कमला वृणोतु कमले'ति मुखरायमाणमुखपीठमर्दविटचेटविदूषककुलसमधिष्ठितं,  
कमलानिदेशाचरणचटुलदूत्यादिगतागतदुष्करप्रवेशं सौवर्णरंभापरिष्कृतै र्वेदिकाप्राभागैः  
शोशुभ्यमानं सर्वतोभद्रं कादम्बर्या भवनम् । अत्र हि —

क्वचि द्वीपा धूपाः क्वचि दमलजातीसुमभरः

क्वचि द्वीटीकूटः क्वचि दमृतधुर्योऽतिमृदुलः ।

क्वचि नारीसंघः क्वचि दमरयोगीश्वरगणो

गृहं कादम्बर्या हरति हृदयं मामक महो ॥

४१

(इति नाट्येन गृहं प्रविश्य मणिवेदिकाया मुपविश्य)

अहो कादम्बरी मदागमश्रवणकुतूहलिनी अभिमुख मापतति । सखि ! एहि !  
कादम्बरि ! किं ब्रवीषि ? कथं मेवं विलम्बितं भावेन ; सर्वेऽपि भावसमागम मेव  
प्रतीक्षन्ते, इति । सखि ! कादम्बरि ! उपक्रम्यतां विवाहोत्सवः ।

(पुरोऽवलोक्य, स्वगतम्)

तन्वङ्गीयं तरलतरला प्रेरिता स्वीयसख्या  
हस्ताब्जाभ्यां विधृतस्र गिमं वीक्षते पुंसमाजम् ।

(सानन्दम्)

भो ! श्चेत स्त्वं भवसि सुकृती यत् कटाक्षाः कियन्तः  
त्वय्येवास्याः कुवलयदृशः संपतन्ति क्रमेण ॥

४२

इयं पुनः कान्ताकारा कमला सख्या प्रेरिताभिमुख मापतति । भो हृदय ! क्षणं सहस्व ।

कान्ताकरपद्माभ्यां निपातितां यत् सुजातिस्रज मेताम् ।  
विनयान्वितेन शिरसा बहुभाग्यानां सुपात्रभूतेन ॥

४३

(सर्वतोऽवलोक्य, प्रकाशम्)

श्राव्यं नागसरध्वनिं श्रुतवता केनापि यूना स्वयं  
लीनं मोहमहोदधौ न सहसा वैवाहिके सन्नि ।  
वाद्या हृद्यतमा मृदङ्गमुरजाद्या अप्यहो सर्वतो  
व्यालीनं द्रवयन्ति मामक मिदं स्वान्तं क्रमा चाडिताः ॥

४४

इयं पुनः कमलाया स्सखी सालभञ्जिका मा मुद्दिश्य किं ब्रवीति ? भाव ! सख्याः  
निरङ्कुशप्रेमभाजनं भवान् । तदेतया सह दोला मारोहतु भावः इति । तर्हि  
तदनुतिष्ठामि ।

(इति तया सह नाट्येन सप्रमोदातिशयं दोला मारुह्य पार्श्वतो विलोक्य, स्वगतम्)

संघटितो मे विधिना कार्मिन्याः पाणिपद्मसंघर्षः ।  
जनय त्यखिलेऽवयवे मदनं सञ्जातपल्लवं पुलकैः ॥

४५

(प्रकाशम्)

अयं गीतध्वानः स्रव दमृतमाधुर्यसुभगः  
कलाविद्धि स्सद्धि मुदितहृदयैः श्लाघितगतिः ।  
अमी वाद्या हृद्या अपि च मुरजाद्याः पुन रमी  
हरन्ति स्वान्तं मे परवश ममेयावधि सुखम् ॥

४६

(पुरोऽवलोक्य, स्वगतम्)

इयं पुन रत्नवधिकानर्घानल्पभूषणभूषिता शोभनाङ्गी विलोकय न्त्यर्धाभ्यां नयनार-  
विन्दाभ्याम् । अद्य हि —

बाणान् पञ्च विसृज्य शम्बररिपुः प्रख्यातभूमा विभु-  
र्जग्राह क्रमशो निसर्गकुटिला मस्या अपाङ्गच्छाम् ।  
मन्ये य न्मयि पार्तिताः पुन रमी बाणा स्समुद्वेजय-  
न्त्यन्ये विश्रुतमार्दवा विरहिणा मुद्वेजका स्ते परम् ॥

४७

अहो सर्वत्र विवाहोत्सवो जरीजृम्भते । मया पुनः कीदृशानि सुकृतानि समार्जितानीति  
न प्रमीयते । यतः ,

दोलायां दयितासमेत मधुना सामाजिका मा मिमे  
पुष्पाणि प्रविकीर्य पार्श्वयुगले वाचाऽनुगृह्णन्ति च ।  
वृद्धाः श्वश्रुमुखा इमा अपि पुर स्तिष्ठन्ति नीराजन-  
क्रीडाबद्धकुतूहला मम मनो रात्रिं पुन धर्यायति ॥

४८

अहह ब्रह्मानन्दसत्रस्रचारिण मानन्द मनुभवामि । तथा हि —

आरुह्य दयितयाऽहं दोलां चलमाननासिकारत्नम् ।  
मुखचन्द्रबिम्ब मस्याः पश्या म्यम्भोजगन्धवह मद्य ॥

४९

(दयितां प्रति जनान्तिकम्)

कदा शय्यागारे परिमलसमावेष्टितगळे  
त्वयाऽहं सँलप्य प्रहसितमुखाम्भोजयुतया ।  
प्रमुग्धे पूर्णेन्दुप्रभमुखि ! मयि त्वं करुणया  
प्रसीदेत्याक्रोश त्रिमिष मिव नेष्यामि रजनीम् ॥

५०

(नेपथ्ये)

भो ! भाव ! यूनो रीप्सितं निर्वर्तयितु मस्त मेप्यति भगवान् मरीचिमाली । (इति  
सलज्जास्मितं जनान्तिकं) सखि भावज्ञो भरतपुत्रः ।

(नेपथ्ये)

सन्ध्याभि स्तिसृभि र्यथेच्छ मुपभुञ्जानं प्रतीची हरित्  
दृष्ट्वात्मान मियं भवे न्मयि रुषा क्रुद्धेति मत्वेव भोः ।

स्नातः पश्चिमसागरे सुविलसत्पट्टांशुको भास्करः  
प्रेम्णा रन्तु मसौ तथा प्रविशति प्रत्यञ्च मर्दिं पुरः ॥

५१

(सानन्दं स्वगतम्)

ईष दङ्कुरितावेतौ कुचकुम्भौ कदा मया ।  
आलिङ्ग्य मण्डलीकारपूर्वं दंशिष्यतेऽधरम् ॥

५२

(पुनर्नेपथ्ये)

उदेति भगवान् कामदेवप्रियसखश्चन्द्रमाः ।

विरहिनिवहारण्यस्याऽयं दवः कुसुमायुध-  
प्रियसखतया ख्यातो विख्यातविक्रमवैभवः ।  
बिलसति वधूमानच्छेत्तोदयक्षितिभूतटे  
निखिलहृदयाह्लादी गाढं स्वयं मृगलाञ्छनः ॥

५३

अपि च,

सन्ध्याताण्डवचातुरीपरिचयोपक्रान्तभीमभ्रमि-  
व्यग्रोमापतिभूषणाहिमुकुटीमाणिक्यशङ्कावहः ।  
अद्रेः पद्मजिगीषयेव शिखरे जातोदयश्चन्द्रमाः  
लोकानां मुदमातनोति तिमिराहङ्कारसर्वकषः ॥

५४

(इति कमला मालोक्य, जनान्तिकम्)

सखि ! आवयोस्साहाय्यमाचरेदेव भगवान् शिशिरकिरणः कामनिगमाधिगमे । ततः,  
उरसि कमले मदीये न्यस्तपदा मञ्जुनादमञ्जीरम् ।  
पातय कटाक्षसरणी माकल्पं कल्पवल्लीं भजताम् ॥

५५

अस्तु यथाभिमतविधायी खलु विधिः । (प्रकाशम्) सर्वतो भद्रम् ।

(नेपथ्ये)

जीया दम्बुधितनयानारायणयो निसर्गतस्सिद्धः ।  
स्नेहो निरवधिमहिमा प्रपञ्चमात्रप्रधानहेतु रयम् ॥

५६

(इति कमला मालोक्य साकूतम्)

सखि ! आवयोः स्नेहरसं प्रपञ्चयति भरतपुत्रः । (सानन्दम्) अयि सुन्दरि !  
एहि ! तथापीद मस्तु —

भरतवाक्यम्

नारायणो विजयतां जलनिधिकन्याविभूषितोरस्कः ।  
अर्थिकलकल्पवृक्षो वन्द्यो देवैश्चतुर्मुखेशमुखैः ॥  
(इति निष्क्रान्तः)

५७

कमलाविलासभाण स्समाप्तः

# SRI VENKATESWARA UNIVERSITY PUBLICATIONS

The following is the list of Sri Venkateswara University publications available for sale, at prices mentioned against them. S.V. University Oriental Journal is the only multi-lingual publication. It contains articles in English, Sanskrit and Telugu. In some of the numbers articles in Tamil or Hindi also are published. All the other works are uni-lingual publications.

S. No.	Particulars of the Work	Price
		Rs.Ps.
1.	S.V. University Oriental Journal Vol. I Parts 1 & 2 (1958)	10-00
2.	-do- Vol. VII Parts 1 & 2 (1964)	10-00
3.	-do- Vol. VIII Parts 1 & 2 (1965)	10-00
4.	-do- Vol. IX Parts 1 & 2 (1966)	10-00
5.	-do- Vol. X Parts 1 & 2 (1967)	10-00
6.	-do- Vol. XI Parts 1 & 2 (1968)	10-00
7.	-do- Vol. XII Parts 1 & 2 (1969)	10-00

## ENGLISH

8. Rūpakasamīkṣā  
Ed. by Dr. E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D. 1964 4-00
9. Vedasamīkṣā  
Ed. by Dr. E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D. 1964 6-00
10. Rāmāyaṇasamīkṣā  
Ed. by Dr. E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D. 1967 5-00
11. The Temples of Kalinga  
by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D. 1965 5-00
12. Indian Aesthetics - Music and Dance  
by Sri K. S. Ramaswami Sastry 1966 1-50
13. Administration and Society in the Carnatic  
by Dr. K. Rajayyan, M.A., Ph.D. 1966 8-00
14. Select Kakatiya Temples  
by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D. 1966 5-00
15. A study of Telugu Compounds  
by Dr. J. Suryanarayana, M.A., Ph.D. 1966 5-00

- |   |      |       |
|---|------|-------|
| 16. A Study of Telugu Semantics<br>by Dr. G.N. Reddy, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1966 | 4-50  |
| 17. The Philosophy of A.N. Whitehead in the light of<br>Advaita Vedanta of Sankara<br>by Dr. P. Nagaraja Rao, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1966 | 3-00  |
| 18. The Values of Shavian Drama<br>by Dr. S. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.  | 1966 | 4-00  |
| 19. The Srirangam Temple<br>by Dr. V.N. Hari Rao, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1967 | 16-50 |
| 20. Ikshvakus of Vijayapuri<br>by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.  | 1967 | 9-00  |
| 21. Student Performance and Adjustment<br>by Dr. S. Narayana Rao, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1967 | 9-00  |
| 22. Inscriptions of Andhra Desa, Vol. I.<br>by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1967 | 17-25 |
| 23. Geometrization of Dynamics<br>by Dr. P.S. Rao, M.A., Ph.D.  | 1967 | 10-00 |
| 24. Inscriptions of Andhra Desa, Vol. II, Part I<br>by Dr. M. Rama Rao, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1967 | 35-00 |
| 25. Historical Grammar of Telugu language with<br>special reference to old Telugu<br>by Dr. K. Mahadeva Sastry, M.A., D.Litt.   | 1969 | 20-00 |
| 26. Studies in Rural Development<br>by Dr. D.L. Narayana, M.A. (Hons.), Ph.D.   | 1970 | 7-00  |
| 27. Gitāsamikṣā<br>Ed. by Dr. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D.   | 1971 | 7-50  |
| 28. A History of Cambodian Independence movement<br>by Dr. V.M. Reddy, M.A., Ph.D.  | 1971 | 8-00  |
| 29. An Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit, Telugu and Tamil<br>Manuscripts (palm-leaf and paper) in the Sri<br>Venkateswara University Oriental Research Insti-<br>tute Library, Tirupati | 1956 | 10-00 |

### SANSKRIT

- |  |      |      |
|--|------|------|
| 30. Gajagrahaṇaprakāra of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita<br>Ed. by Dr. E.R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D. | 1968 | 2-50 |
|--|------|------|

31. Apāṇiniyaprāmāṇya-sādhanaṁ of Nārāyaṇa  
Bhaṭṭapāda  
Ed. by Dr. E R. Sreekrishna Sarma, M.A., Ph.D. 1968 0-75
32. Kāvyaṁṣṭam of Śrīvatsalāṅghana  
Ed. by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D. 1971 Price  
to be  
fixed
33. Kamalāvilāsabhāṇa of Nārāyaṇakavi  
Ed. by Dr. K.S. Ramamurti, M.A., Ph.D. 1971 „

### TELUGU

34. Thyagaraja's Prahlada Bhakti Vijayam  
by Prof. P. Sambamurthy 1965 7-00

### TAMIL

35. Muthollayira Vilakkam  
by Sri N. Subbu Reddiar 1965 7-00

### HINDI

36. Hindi Kavya Ruponka Adhyayan  
by Dr. R.B. Sarma, M.A., Ph.D. 1967 6-75
37. Acharya Hazari Prasad Dvivedi - Vyaktitva aur  
Krititva  
by Dr. B.K. Sathyanarayana, M.A., Ph.D. 1967 4-50

### URDU

38. Naqude Abul Qalam  
by Dr. R.U. Ahmed 1971 Price  
to be  
fixed

- 
1. All the University Publications are now supplied only on pre-payment of cost and postage either by money-order or demand draft, payable to the Registrar of this University.

This condition of pre-payment may be relaxed to some extent in the case of Registered Publishers, Local Library Authorities, Universities, Affiliated Colleges and other recognised Educational Institutions in India on correspondence. A nominal discount of 5% to 10% may be allowed to them on their own merits.

2. A trade discount of 25% is allowed to all the Registered Book-sellers only.



3. The Annual subscription rates of the S.V.U.O. Journals are as follows :

- |            |     |  |
|------------|-----|--|
| 1. Inland  | ... | Rs. 10/-                               |
| 2. Foreign | ... | 20 Shillings or<br>2 Dollers 50 Cents. |

These Foreign rates apply to all the back numbers also and the Journal sent post free by Surface mail, but if the party requires it to be despatched by air-mail, the air-mail charges have to be borne by the party.

N.B. :- The annual subscription rates of the S.V. University Oriental Journal from Vol. XIV of 1971 which will be issued in two parts separately will be as follows :

- |            |     |                                    |
|------------|-----|------------------------------------|
| 1. Inland  | ... | Rs. 15/-                           |
| 2. Foreign | ... | £ 1 & 15 Shillings or<br>4 Dollars |

